The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 29, 1903.

The Week.

The latest news concerning the Venezuelan dispute betokens a peaceful settlement and an early raising of the blockade. For this result all the parties concerned should be congratulated, but none more so than the Government and people of the United States. The happy turn of affairs has doubtless been hastened by the adverse comment of the press of both Europe and America on the German bombardment of San Carlos, and the attempted justification of it by Chancellor von Bülow. Regarded as a method of maintaining German prestige, that attack upon a mud fort and a collection of naked fishermen must be regarded as a failure. It appears now that Minister Bowen came to Washington with full powers to settle the controversy, and it will probably turn out that this fact was known in Berlin before any guns were fired at San Carlos. Possibly it was not known to the German Admiral, possibly the Venezuelans fired the first shot; but the event has left the impression on the minds of impartial observers that Germany wanted to show what her navy could do, and that she chose an inauspicious time for making that demonstration.

Settlement with Colombia of the question of American rights in the Panama Canal territory brings considerably nearer the date when, if the treaty be duly ratified in the Senate, payment must be made to the Panama stockholders. This matter has already created great interest in Wall Street, where curiosity converges on the question in what form the payment will be made, and exactly how it will be provided for. The arrangement with the French owners of the franchise contemplates, as is well known, outright payment of $40,000,000 to them at Paris. This money, so far as now appears, will be taken from the Treasury surplus, of which $149,882,000 is now held in the Government's own vaults, offset by $86,792,000 immediate liabilities, while an additional $142,921,000 stands in the national banks subject to the Treasury's check. These sums, it will be seen, are quite sufficient to provide for a $40,000,000 payment, and it is safe to say that the suggestion of an issue of Government bonds to provide the money will get no hearing. Indeed, the $40,000,000 for the purchase was formally appropriated by Congress, at the close of the last session.

What chiefly interests the money market, however, is the question whether the remittance in question, with the $10,000,000 due to Colombia, will or will not be taken from the general money market; that is to say, whether exchange on London or Paris will be bought with cash from the Treasury's own vaults, or with checks on the depositary banks. It would seem, in view of the Treasury's recent declaration that its cash holdings had fallen nearly to a "working minimum," that the bank deposits would be used. The still more interesting question, from the financial point of view, whether the payment would or would not involve large shipments of gold to Paris, is not so easy to answer. Such payments do not always drain a market of its gold. The $1,000,000,000 German indemnity claim on France, after the war of 1870, is a classic case in point. This huge payment, though provided by loans from the thrifty French people, was actually made, for the most part, in bills of exchange on other countries. Apparently, France had created so huge a credit fund elsewhere, through transfer of its own investment capital during the war, that it was able to draw on the English market for the gold. On the other hand, our own payment of $20,000,000 at Paris, during 1899, in settlement with Spain for the Philippine cession, went, to all practical purposes, in gold. The formal payment, it is true, was made in bills of exchange without coincident gold exports. But the very heavy demand for foreign remittances, during April, forced up the sterling market to a figure which resulted, two months later, in the export of almost exactly $20,000,000 gold to Europe.

From what has been given out of the treaty for determining the Alaskan boundary, it appears to be another triumph for Mr. Hay's diplomacy. The clause which assures to the United States all the coast settlements already in existence in the disputed territory, will hardly be popular in Canada. For this includes Skaguay, at the head of the Lynn Canal, and lessens the likelihood that Canada will gain the desired access to the Pacific. Still, this condition of the negotiation is fair to both parties, for Skaguay was settled at a time when American possession of the Lynn Canal had not been seriously questioned. The plan for a commission of six, three Americans and three British, has at first sight the disadvantage that the court may divide evenly and no decision be reached. It should rather be taken as an indication of the friendly spirit in which the investigation is to be conducted. Either nation is in the position of assuming that the representatives of the other are open to conviction. The practical difficulty arising from the lack of an umpire is likely to be small, for the boundary commission will not be precisely in the position of a court which must accept or reject *in toto* the entire claim of one or the other party to the suit. It will rather review the whole question and settle it in equity. It will concern itself rather with the Alaskan coast line, as it is now known to be, than with what the Russians of the thirties or the Canadians of the nineties have thought about that littoral. The boundary affair is, in the main, a very simple one, though somewhat obscured by national prejudices on either side. It is matter of rejoicing that this long dispute is now likely to be adjusted by direct and friendly negotiations.

Congressman Hill of Connecticut carried his point on Thursday by defeating the currency bill reported by the House Philippine Committee, and substituting a measure which establishes the gold standard in the islands, with a subsidiary coinage of limited legal tender, redeemable in gold at the rate of two pesos for one American dollar. The substitute provides that the money of the United States shall be legal tender in the Philippines, and declares the coinage laws of the United States to be in full force there. It provides for the redemption of the Mexican and Spanish silver (not including any Mexican pesos imported into the islands after March 15, 1903) at their bullion value, as declared from time to time by the Philippine Commission. After six months no coin except that of the United States shall be full legal tender, but with the proviso that all debts, except those otherwise provided for in the contract, owing on the date when the act shall take effect or contracted within six months thereafter, shall be payable in the silver coins now in circulation in the Philippine Islands or in the lawful money of the United States at the rate of exchange prescribed at the time by the Philippine Commission. As there is no silver of full legal tender provided for, the limping standard will not be introduced. The vote on the adoption of Mr. Hill's substitute was 146 to 128.

It is a very queer story that comes from Washington implying that the Senate's Philippine currency bill is part of a scheme for a kind of Latin Monetary Union, including Mexico, China, the Straits Settlements, and the Philippines, in order to do something for silver. How this end is to be accomplished is not stated, and we fancy that it will not make much headway in the world until somebody can write down the *modus ope-*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

randi and point out the consequences of each step to be taken. To all persons who think that a union of different countries to regulate their monetary affairs on a common basis and by concerted action is feasible, we recommend a study of Professor Willis's 'History of the Latin Monetary Union.' They will there find ample proof of the futility of such attempts. If it be said that this Washington plan is entirely different from the one whose mishaps are so faithfully and minutely chronicled by Professor Willis, then let us have the Washington plan formulated by somebody who knows what it is. At present it is too cloudy for intelligent criticism.

The discussion in the Senate on Saturday upon the Indianola post-office case undoubtedly marks the revival of a series of debates upon the race relations in the South, which probably will become one of the leading issues of the next Congress. The question of the disfranchisement of the negroes is certain to come before the next House by means of contested election cases. The standing of the whole Virginia representation must be passed upon by the House Elections Committees. The perennial motion for the reduction of the South's representation in Congress is also soon to be heard from, while the hubbub about negro office-holding is bound to continue as long as President Roosevelt declines to "shut the door of hope" to aspiring and qualified negro candidates for Government positions. Reduction of representation the Southern States will probably accept without demur, rather than give up their present unrepublican Constitutions. As long as men like McLaurin and Tillman continue to represent the South, it is useless to expect that any just demand for equality of opportunity for the negro can ever obtain a hearing. To this the Tillman reply is simply, "Kill." The whole subject is beclouded, too, by the fear of negro domination, just as the ante-bellum South was nightly terrorized by fears of slave insurrections. In the Indianola case, Senator Spooner's citations from the executive documents showed conclusively that the postmistress was forced to resign by a mass meeting of white citizens, who could find no other ground for fault-finding than the color of her skin, and were working in the interests of a Republican candidate for the office.

It seems cruel to mention it, but Senator Hoar is evidently falling hopelessly behind the times. It is all very well for him to have conscientious Constitutional views about the prerogatives of the Senate and of Congress in its relations with the President, but he ought to know that nowadays nobody pays any attention to little things like these. What up-to-date member of the Senate or House cares for the prerogatives of Congress so long as his local bill or his legislative scheme goes through? Old fellows like Senator Hoar will have to get used to the new methods. There was a time, even at Albany, while Mr. Roosevelt was Governor, when some faint protests were heard against executive pressure upon the Legislature. Gov. Roosevelt was something of a rough rider in matters of prerogative when he was at Albany, we may tell Senator Hoar, but they had to make the best of it. It was he, for instance, who took the emergency message down from the dignified shelf where the Constitutional Convention clearly intended to place it, and converted it into a ready instrument for passing legislation, local and otherwise, like greased lightning, *sans* printing, *sans* debate, *sans* everything. Senator Hoar evidently does not yet know what it means to have a young and enthusiastic President.

Senator Hanna is certainly loyal to his friends, even when the latter are disreputable. He has now come forward to the rescue of Addicks. In his official capacity as Chairman of the Republican National Committee, he telegraphs to the Regular Republicans in the Delaware Legislature that he hopes they will never stoop so low as to vote for an honest Democrat in order to prevent the success of a Republican corruptionist. The Republican party, he declares, is "entitled to the fruits of victory," and the fact that they are rotten fruits does not trouble Mr. Hanna in the least. He has done what he could to disgrace both Delaware and the United States Senate. Apparently, the honorable compromise offered by the Delaware Democrats is to be rejected. There is no sign, however, that Addicks, even with Hanna's help, can win over enough votes to be elected. So the best prospect for the State at present is that it will go unrepresented. Better that, *pace* Senator Hanna, than to go dishonored.

All organs of public opinion in Congress, the press, and the bar ought to take notice of the Doblin-Quigg case at Washington, and not allow it to pass off as a mystery, still less as a matter for jest or sarcasm. It is perfectly certain that perjury has been committed of a peculiarly brazen and damaging kind. It is probable that corruption of a Congressman was attempted, in order to get money from the public treasury. Moreover, the dignity and authority of Congress have been insulted and flouted in the most glaring manner. If such things can be done without somebody going to the penitentiary, there is not much use in having laws and a system of jurisprudence. Whatever we may think of Quigg or of Lessler, there can not be two opinions about Doblin. This fellow went before a committee of Congress, in response to a legal summons, and swore that Quigg authorized him to offer $5,000 to Congressman Lessler for his support of a bill to buy torpedo boats. At the very next meeting of the Committee he swore that his former statement was false, and that he had been induced by Lessler to make the former statement. Thus he acknowledged that he had committed perjury, and accused Lessler of subornation of perjury. Doblin ought to have been arrested before he left the committee room, even though his counsel promised to produce him when wanted. The offence he had committed was too grave, the insult he had offered to the highest authority in the land—the very source of low and justice—was too shocking to be tolerated or neglected for a moment. Quigg will probably escape the clutches of the law, for nobody can now believe anything that Doblin says, whether for or against him.

Gov. Odell is said to have been too busy to see Superintendent McCullagh when that worthy called to present his annual report at Albany on Thursday. The Superintendent's term of office has expired, and it is understood that he seeks reappointment. We trust that, however busy he may be, the Governor will find time to look up McCullagh's record as head of the Metropolitan Bureau of Elections before he makes up his mind to reappoint him, and also to read carefully the various statements, all bearing the earmarks of authenticity, which the Superintendent is reported to have made, and has not denied making, since the submarine boat scandal came out in Washington. What deduction must the Governor draw from the Superintendent's assertion that Mr. Lessler conceded his election to be due largely to McCullagh's use of the election machinery? Is it true, then, that he has been, as Democrats have charged, a mere annex of the Republican machine? Is he using his office and his deputies to pack primaries and control elections? And, having done this, has he been trading upon the gratitude of his beneficiaries to get them to vote for schemes in which his "particular friends" are interested? There is certainly an appearance of this. The wisdom of keeping him in his place might well have been questioned after the exhibitions of childishness and folly which he gave previous to the last election, with his indiscriminate and unwarranted challenges throughout the city, but this is as nothing compared with his course as revealed by his recent statements. A proposal to abolish the bureau would be worth serious consideration. It certainly would be better to abolish it than to permit McCullagh to remain at its head.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Gov. Pennypacker of Pennsylvania treads softly in his message to the Legislature. There are many excellent reflections in his first State paper, indicating philosophic habits of thought and scholarly attainments; but one searches it in vain for one bold word directed against the political abuses which have made the name of Pennsylvania a by-word among the States. One terrible evil, it is true, he does allude to feelingly: "There is no more dangerous public vice," he declares, "than the prevalent affectation of disrespect for those engaged in the performance of the work of the cities, the State, and the nation." This evidently means Ashbridge, Durham, Quay, and the rest. The Governor has no intention of falling into this "prevalent affectation," but, on the contrary, promises to consult and confer "with all who have facts to impart or conclusions to present, especially those who, in common parlance, are called politicians." How Quay must smile when he reads this rubbish! Passing from so gloomy a discussion as that of public disrespect to such high dignitaries as Quay and Durham, Gov. Pennypacker has a word to say about Pennsylvania products profiting foreign markets. "While it is a satisfaction to see libraries in England and universities in Chicago being erected from the outcome of the iron and oil of Pennsylvania, due primarily to her liberality," says the Governor, "we may be pardoned a feeling of regret that so much of the wealth of her production is controlled and utilized elsewhere." That this is the stern logic of the Pennsylvania protectionist, who will deny?

If any one had a lingering hope that Gov. Pennypacker might yet indicate some desire to better political conditions in Pennsylvania, it must now have received its death-blow. If Pennsylvania is ever to be raised from the low estate into which she has fallen under the domination of Quay and his gang, the first step must be a reform of the ballot law. This is common knowledge in Pennsylvania, and is indeed so patent that both parties, in their platforms last year, promised modern registration laws and other measures to prevent frauds on election day. The necessity for such enactments, moreover, was rendered more clear than ever before by the very election which made Judge Pennypacker Governor. The most barefaced frauds in Philadelphia were exposed by the election figures. We quoted at the time the returns from several Philadelphia wards where, according to the official tables, the total vote more than doubled that of the year before, the increase being made up wholly of alleged Republican votes. Of course, no such votes were ever cast. Surely, with his party platform before him, Gov. Pennypacker should have had the scant courage required to say something about these frauds. But not a word does he utter. He does say that the present law is "cumbersome and inefficient," and suggests that it be changed, but he hastens to add that "the thought that something ought to be done by means of the law to encourage independent voting and to make it difficult to vote a full party ticket is mere vicious theorizing." What can the cause of decent government hope from a man, however respectable his antecedents, who thus exhibits himself on his entrance into office?

Corporations are not alone in using a million-dollar yardstick. The latest financial exhibit of the United Mine Workers of America, presented at the annual session in Indianapolis, amply explains how that organization could support the long strike of last summer. Manifestly, the old plan of starving out strikers cannot avail against an organization, which, after expending nearly $2,000,000 in strike aid, ended or suspended the conflict with over $1,000,000 in the war chest. There is a not obscure menace in those figures, as well. An organization thus financially buttressed is in a fair condition to renew the struggle, if its members are so inclined. Plainly, such a financial power has to be reckoned with, and as long as such a huge fund is in sight, it is idle to expect disintegration of the Mine-Workers' Union.

A Mount Vernon saloon which dispensed the beer of the Central Federated Union was recently "cleaned out" by representatives of the National Union of the United Brewer Workers. This same doubly united body has also declared a boycott against one of our city brewers. The grievance in the latter case is that the employer will not force his men to resign from the local union to which they already belong, and make them join the United Brewer Workers. The lot of an employer under these circumstances is an unhappy one. He cannot consult his customer's thirst or his own profit until some higher power has decided which of two sorts of union beer is alone authentic and vouched for by organized labor. Instances like this of squabbling unions continue to show how far the labor movement still is from that sobriety and wisdom which it must attain if it is to gain public respect and confidence. What will become in bad times of organizations which, having professedly common aims, cannot in good times agree upon common action? In the present case it is encouraging to note that President Gompers of the American Federation of Labor has declared the boycott to be unauthorized.

Mr. Brett, the President of the Macmillan Company, protests, in a letter to the *Evening Post*, against a new ruling of the Appraiser's Department of the Custom-house. Under former practice, the duties on imported books were assessed on their actual cost in the foreign market. Under the new ruling they are to be assessed on their average price in the foreign market, if it is higher than the actual price paid by the American importer. This ruling breaks up an established trade of long duration, since prices of certain lines of foreign books which are regularly imported have become fixed, but they cannot be sold at those prices under the new ruling. Moreover, the foreign publisher, when he discovers that the Custom-house has raised the price of his books by a certain percentage, raises his selling price by the same amount, so that the new ruling operates to the advantage of the foreign seller and to the disadvantage of the American buyer. Among all the exasperating devices invented to cripple trade and to lead Americans to execrate their own Custom-house, this is perhaps the least defensible, since it has the excuse of neither revenue nor protection. The Government does not need the extra money; on the contrary, it needs relief from its surplus. And, as Mr. Brett shows, the doctrine of protection is in no way concerned in the matter. It is true, however, that the law warrants the appraiser in taking this step.

President Sharpless of Haverford has polled the college presidents on the subject of football, and brings out a complete unanimity of opinion. All agree that the plunging mass plays should be abolished, and the rules changed to favor agility rather than brute strength. The presidents in council differ only as to who is to be the one to begin. This is a matter of complete indifference. There is nothing easier than to bell the football cat. Let any president of one of the great universities say to the Committee on Rules, which is soon to meet, that his institution will not be allowed to engage in intercollegiate contests until the present rules have been radically modified. If President Eliot, for example, should take this stand, the reform of the game would be brought about promptly, for very slight changes would deprive football of its present appearance of a mêlée and restore the more open play of fifteen years ago. Let the Committee on Rules increase to ten yards the distance which the ball must be advanced in four "downs," and the present short rushes, which are uninteresting to the spectator and dangerous to the player, would disappear. Forbid more than four men to play behind the line, and the present crushing "tandems" and "formations" would be impossible. These simple changes would bring back bold running and frequent kicking—always the most attractive features of football, and of old the very reason of its existence.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE COLOMBIAN TREATY.

By bringing the negotiations for the Panama Canal to a successful close, Secretary Hay has gained a notable advantage for the country and new laurels for himself. His task was in any case one of great delicacy. It had become doubly difficult because of recent intervention by American marines on the Isthmus in a way to ruffle the sensibilities of the Colombian Republic. Any mishandling of the canal negotiations might have put off to the Greek kalends the transfer of the French concession to us. The manner in which Mr. Hay has reconciled the just pride of the owners of the Isthmus with the necessary preponderance of ourselves as owners of the prospective canal, is highly honorable. The Hay-Herran treaty, then, stands not only as a model of successful business negotiation, but also as a striking instance of fair, open, magnanimous, and conciliatory dealing with a weaker Power. The result is even better than had been looked for. After the long dispute over the annual rental to be paid to Colombia for the right of way, it was commonly supposed that reference to a commission or court of arbitration would be necessary to determine the amount. Such a proceeding, however, was full of danger, since the inevitable delay would infuse new life into the Nicaragua project, and might put an end to the Panama bargain altogether. The temper of Congress on this subject was very uncertain, and although the Canal Commission was more and more inclined to the opinion that a canal in Nicaragua was impracticable, the House of Representatives was strongly committed to the opposite belief. The danger incident to an arbitration having been passed, there is nothing to wait for except the Senate's ratification of the agreement.

The treaty grants an exclusive franchise for the canal for one hundred years, renewable at the sole and absolute option of the United States so long as the United States may desire, in consideration of the payment of $10,000,000 down and an annual payment of $250,000. The annual payments are to begin nine years after the date of the ratification of the treaty. The neutrality of the canal is declared to be perpetual, according to the terms of the Hay-Pauncefote Convention of 1901. This includes the right of all nations to use the canal without discrimination in tolls or otherwise. The right of the United States to land troops for the protection of the canal is conceded in cases where the Government of Colombia fails to afford such protection. General sovereignty over the zone of the canal is reserved to Colombia, but the United States is authorized to establish judicial tribunals in said zone, which shall have exclusive jurisdiction of all controversies therein between citizens of the United States, or between them and citizens of any foreign nation other than the republic of Colombia. Provision is made also for joint tribunals to have criminal jurisdiction of offences committed within the zone, and in admiralty cases. The treaty seems to have been drawn with the utmost care and in the spirit of perfect fairness. It would be difficult to point out any feature to which reasonable exception could be taken. The time for ratification expires September 22, 1903. If the present session of Congress should expire before ratification is voted on (which ought to be impossible), a special session of the Senate would doubtless be called by the President to complete the transaction.

Due acknowledgment should be made to the republic of Colombia for its jurisdictional concession, seeing that all the Spanish-American countries are extremely sensitive on this subject. Exemption from local jurisdiction granted to citizens of Christian countries resident in Mohammedan countries and in some other non-Christian lands goes by the name of extra-territoriality. This is not exactly what Colombia grants to us, since citizens of the United States residing in Colon, or anywhere in Colombia outside of the canal zone, are subject to the Colombian tribunals exclusively. The concession is limited strictly to the canal zone, but it is all that we could ask.

We are sure that this treaty will be heartily welcomed by the American people. We believe, too, that the best possible bargain, if not the only possible one, has been made to insure an interoceanic canal. It is the growing opinion of engineers, both official and unofficial, that De Lesseps was right when he chose the Panama route in preference to all others. If the Panama line is the most economical, both for construction and for operation, we have made a great bargain in getting the concession and property of the French Company for $40,000,000, which cost them many times that amount, and is now worth more than that to us, even if much money was wasted under the De Lesseps management. We may now for the first time look forward to the realization of hopes which have been entertained for three-quarters of a century, that the isthmus will be pierced and made available for the ships of all nations within a computable time. The period named in the treaty for the beginning of work on the canal proper is two years, and for its completion twelve years, with a proviso for accidents and unforeseen obstacles.

LATEST ASPECTS OF THE CUBAN TREATY.

The exclusion clause added to the Cuban treaty by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations provides that "no sugar, the product of any other foreign country, shall be admitted by treaty or convention into the United States, while this convention is in force, at a lower rate of duty than that provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897." The clause in this form avoids an embarrassment which might arise in case Congress should deem it advisable, at some time during the next five years, to reduce or repeal the duty on sugar. It does not tie the hands of Congress and the President in their legislative capacity, but does undertake to tie the hands of President and Senate as to treaty-making. If the Cuban treaty goes into effect, we pledge ourselves not to offer as good terms to any other sugar-producing country during five years. It is conceivable that the Democrats may carry the next Presidential election. It is possible that even a Republican President and Senate may find reasons for offering to Germany or France, in the way of reciprocity, the same terms that we now offer to Cuba, but they will not be able to do so. We do not marvel that Democratic Senators, who have heretofore favored reciprocity with Cuba, look with suspicion upon this clause, and all the more since it was not a part of the treaty as it came from the hands of the negotiators.

There has been some debate in the German Reichstag lately on the American interpretation of the most-favored-nation clause, and an understanding has been reached that Germany shall construe it in her dealings with us in the same way that we interpret it in our dealings with her. This, it should be remarked, is not a new decision on the part of Germany. Professor Moore of Columbia University has pointed out, in a discussion of this subject, that Germany recognized and assented to the American interpretation in a treaty which she made with Hawaii in 1879. She then agreed that special advantages in trade or navigation granted by one nation to another, in exchange for equivalent advantages, did not bring the most-favored-nation clause into operation as regards any third party. This has been the contention of the United States since 1817, when John Quincy Adams, as Secretary of State, formulated it in a note to the French Minister at Washington. Any gratuitous advantage given to one nation must be given immediately and *ipso facto* to any other which is sheltered by the favored-nation clause, and it can be claimed in return. But favors granted by treaty in the way of bargain for favors received do not come within this category.

The next question that presents itself is whether a country, A, acting under the most-favored-nation clause with B, is bound, when it gives special favors to C for a consideration, to offer the same to B for a like consideration. Good faith would seem to require such action. It may happen, however, that B is not able to give the same favors that C has

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

offered. B may not be the producer of similar goods, or she may have given previously and without consideration everything she had in the way of trading capital. That is England's position now. The most-favored-nation clause, as now interpreted, has nothing of value for her, and she can recover her rights under it only by building a tariff wall of her own, and lowering it here and there according to the bargains she may be able to make with other countries. There is a strong suspicion that it is the aim of her present Colonial Secretary to introduce that policy.

Germany, however, is not thus hampered. She has not given away her trading capital in advance. She announces that if the most-favored-nation clause is to be annulled by interpretation, so be it. She will admit the cereals of Russia and Hungary at a minimum tariff in exchange for their minima on other things, and then she will extend the same favors to us, not by virtue of the most-favored-nation clause, but by way of bargain. That will be perfectly fair, and we could not complain. So we come together to see how we can place ourselves on the footing of the most-favored-nations as an exporter of grain to Germany. The latter would be apt to ask for the admission of her sugar at our ports at the same rate of duty as that of Cuban sugar in return for suitable concessions to our grain or other exports. Here, perhaps, we run against a clause in our treaty with Cuba which binds us for five years not to make any concessions on sugar to Germany, no matter what consideration is offered in return.

Germany would be justified in considering this a violation of both the letter and the spirit of the most-favored-nation clause, since it takes from her the opportunity of recovering her trade footing with the United States by offering equivalent advantages. The case with Great Britain is much the same. Her West Indian colonies are entitled to as good treatment as we give to Cuba, and, considering how much we owe to England in connection with the war which set Cuba free from Spain, we ought not to shut and double-lock the door against Jamaica, Guiana, etc., as is proposed in this new clause of the Cuban treaty. It would be interesting to know what the controlling motive for this clause is. No tariff bill ever passes Congress without a private job in it, either concealed or open. The Cuban treaty is a tariff bill on a small scale. Perhaps an agreement has been made between the domestic and the Cuban sugar interests to divide the American market for five years to the exclusion of all other producers.

HERRING, LODGE, AND THE TREATY.

The herring are those that are smuggled into Massachusetts ports from Newfoundland; Lodge is the Massachusetts Senator under whose nose the smuggling is done; the treaty is, of course, the Hay-Bond treaty, which would turn the traffic in contraband herring into an honest industry. Our attention was called to the matter by an observation in a contemporary. Commenting on the statement made by a representative of the fish trade, that the passage of the Hay-Bond treaty would mean the loss of hundreds of thousands of revenue, the *Syren and Shipping* remarked tartly that, if this were so, the loss would be no greater than it had been for years past. The saying seemed dark to us—nay, mathematically impossible—but we had sufficient confidence in our well-informed contemporary to look up the whole matter of the Newfoundland coast fisheries. The results of this investigation show, in brief, that the winter herring entered free at Gloucester and Boston by American "fishermen" are bought of the Newfoundlanders, and hence are subject to duty; that free entry is secured by perjury; finally, that the Government winks at this illicit trade.

The methods of the herring smugglers may be thus succinctly set forth: Undermanned schooners ply from the New England ports to the coast of Newfoundland. There they buy herring of the natives at the legal rate of $1.25 a barrel; these herring are by false affidavits represented as "the product of American fisheries." The more scrupulous perjurers in the trade keep an old net, or even a boat that floats, on the Newfoundland coast. Some even send a sailor to watch the Newfoundlanders draw the herring nets. In these various ways they maintain the fiction that the fish are "taken by American vessels" assisted "by men and nets hired in a foreign port." Generally, however, no attempt is made to keep up the pretence of a fishing industry, and the trade is conducted for what it is—a trade. The loss to our customs is conservatively estimated at upwards of $125,000 a year.

How this open and organized smuggling has become an institution in the protectionist State of Massachusetts it would be interesting to inquire. It will surprise no one that the clause which puts American-caught Newfoundland herring on the free list, is found imbedded in the paragraph on "oils" in the Dingley Act (Sec. 626). But it will be surprising to learn that the winter-herring trade has been for years "protected" at Washington, that the Collector of the Port of Boston was in 1898 virtually reprimanded for enforcing the law in the case of the herring fishermen, and bidden to follow the benevolent "practice of the port of Gloucester." It may seem strange, too, that an easy form of affidavit (omitting the pregnant words of a previous Treasury decision—"fish taken by an American vessel") was supplied by the Treasury Department with a view to avoiding any undue strain upon the consciences of the North Shore and fish freighters. It would be interesting to know why all the political influence of the "banner" protectionist State has been exerted to facilitate the trade in contraband herring—and we suggest that the question be referred to Senator Lodge. Not that we think he knows what his smuggling supporters have been about, but first because he has for years, unwittingly as we must believe, played their game for them; and, second, because he has exceptional opportunities for ascertaining the truth, being able to whiff the contraband herring from his Nahant residence.

Will not some protectionist Senator from a State which has no organized smuggling industry of its own, or, failing that, a Democrat, put the following questions to Senator Lodge:

"(1.) Why was a special report, ordered by the Treasury in 1896, which thoroughly exposed the fraudulent nature of the winter-herring trade, suppressed and no action taken?

"(2.) Through what influence was the clause 'other articles the products of such fisheries' (*i. e.*, oil fisheries) in the McKinley Bill interpreted by the Treasury to mean herring?

"(3.) Who brought it about that fifty cases begun in 1897 by the United States against 'fishermen' who had presented fraudulent manifests were terminated by an order of nolle prosequi?

"(4.) Why did the Treasury Department in 1898 forbid the Boston Custom-house to enforce United States law, substituting therefor 'the long-established practice of the port of Gloucester'?

"(5.) What reason had the Treasury, in issuing the order of 1898, to assume that Congress had 'full knowledge of the facts' of herring smuggling? Assuming this, why should the Treasury have taken it for granted that a protectionist Congress would wink at a particular kind of smuggling simply because it was 'the practice of the port of Gloucester'?"

If Senator Lodge should answer these questions gladly, the inquirer might be encouraged further to use his Senatorial courtesy and to ask:

"Should a scholar in politics and a high priest of protectionism let himself be used by a pack of hardy smugglers? And should this same hierophant of the protectionist idea oppose any motion to make the honest import trade easier, until he has made the dishonest import trade in his own State harder?"

There are various ways in which Senator Lodge might answer these questions. He might, for example, draw the red herring of evasion across the trail of honest inquiry. But the most effective way to answer such questions would be to come out strongly for the Hay-Bond treaty, to speak for it, and work for it. This treaty, by removing the duty on Newfoundland herring, would make honest traders of all the herring smugglers in Mr. Lodge's vicinity. It is one of the very rare instances in which virtue may be imposed as by act of Congress, and the opportunity should not be neglected. Furthermore, the Hay-Bond treaty, by offering better bait and port facilities in Newfoundland, will do

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much to further the real American fisheries of the Banks. On the contrary, if Senator Lodge and his fellow protectionists defeat the treaty, Newfoundland will undoubtedly retaliate in a way disastrous both to the heroic Banks fishermen and to their thrifty brethren of the winter-herring boats. In view of these facts Senator Lodge should feel that in putting him between the Newfoundland herring and the Newfoundland treaty we have only put him in his proper place, and merely indicated his proper responsibility.

WORKING THROUGH THE FILIPINOS.

So recently was Emilio Aguinaldo a contemptible revolutionist, a ridiculous fugitive, a man who had sold his country for gold and prated of a liberty which he could not understand, that it is surprising to find him now gravely quoted in the Imperialist press as an authority upon things Philippine. Yet this is what the War Department has brought about by giving out his carefully prepared views upon the terrible conditions now prevailing in the archipelago. Not only Mr. Root, but the President, seems to be anxious lest Congress adjourn without appropriating the three millions asked to keep the Filipinos from starvation. The House has not yet concerned itself with the matter. In order to induce Congress to act, therefore, Aguinaldo himself is cited to confirm Gov. Taft's sad picture of the straits to which our Filipino wards are reduced. A "remarkable presentation" is the way the *Tribune* describes Aguinaldo's petition, yet not one whit more remarkable than the fact of its seeing the light of day by grace of the same War Department which, five years ago, had no ears for anything that Aguinaldo or his countrymen might say.

We welcome this action of the War Department as a hopeful sign of a changed attitude on its part towards the Filipinos. The entire country is now in a better frame of mind to judge them and their aspirations fairly. The bitter feelings engendered by a needless and cruel war have begun to disappear, and with them an endless number of misconceptions and misunderstandings. There is an apparently growing desire to work through the Filipinos themselves in our efforts to restore the islands to the state of prosperity in which we found them in 1898. The War Department could, of course, never have intended to lend its sanction to Aguinaldo's intricate scheme for the relief of the suffering islanders. Even were it in sympathy with his particular plan, it would not venture to ask so much of this Congress as a careful and scientific consideration of the whole insular situation. It is rather, we take it, a desire to let Congressmen look at the problem through a Filipino's eyes that has moved Mr. Root to publish Aguinaldo's statement. Such a step would not have been thought of even two years ago. The growing tolerance elsewhere was well illustrated the other evening by Senator Dolliver's remark at a dinner in this city, that "the best thing that we had ever got out of the Philippines was the fact that we were getting out." Surely this utterance of a Republican Senator would have been high treason in 1900.

It is very likely that a perusal of the Philippine Commission's annual report had something to do with the War Department's action. In his summary of the situation as it presented itself on November 1, Gov. Taft bears strong testimony to the Filipinos who have been given high office. "The native governors, on the whole," he says, "have proven to be quite satisfactory. They take great pride in their provinces, and, with the exception of two or three who seem to be listless and fearful of making enemies, they are exerting all their influence, which is very great among the people, to foster industry and law-abiding habits." Gov. Taft believes that it will not be necessary to remove more than two or three. Surely, a people of which this can be said within a year after the cessation of a devastating war, may claim to be well along the road to self-government. Indeed, Gov. Taft's praise recalls the very complimentary things said about the Filipino Congress by John Barrett and other American observers in the summer and fall of 1898.

The work of Filipino officials is praised in other parts of the Philippine report. Of Col. Tecson, recently an insurgent leader and now Governor of Bulacan, it is said that he has organized and led a volunteer force so effectively that his province bids fair to be freer from lawlessness than ever before in its history. For the police of Manila it was found advisable to enlist many prominent insurgent leaders. It is reported now that the present efficiency of the native police is very largely due to the work of these men, against whose appointment there was at first a great outcry from the American press in Manila. As far as the provincial governments are concerned, it would appear that Governor Taft has been eminently justified in putting responsibility upon Filipinos as fast as possible.

In a recent paper read before the British Colonial Institute, Mr. Hugh Clifford called attention to the very great success achieved by the British administrators in the Malay Peninsula. Here a few officers have acquired the confidence of the Sultans, induced them to maintain order, prevailed upon them to use civilized methods of taxation, ended violence and interstate wars, and generally improved conditions, always by working through the natives and not, as in India, by means of a large body of English officials. As the *Spectator* has pointed out, this Malayan plan, which it properly calls the indirect method of governing a subject people, has many advantages. The state careers are left open to the natives; the governing class, as well as the toilers, is improved, and there is no dead level produced by the presence of a class of foreign office-holders. Furthermore, nothing characteristic of the native race is crushed out. This is the only proper way for the United States to do its work of rebuilding in the Philippines, with this distinction, that it should always keep before itself a higher ideal than England has set herself in Malaya or anywhere else—retirement from the archipelago within a very short time. If the War Department and Governor Taft are beginning to plan for the Filipinos along lines like these, their future is one of great promise, despite their present grievous plight.

THE NATION VS. INDIANOLA.

Last Saturday's debate in the Senate served to clear up the point really at issue in the case of the closed post-office at Indianola, Miss. It is only incidentally a question of the civil rights of the negro. Color prejudice and race exclusions enter into the matter merely by a side door. The challenge which the President took up was an unmistakable challenge of the national supremacy. What he had to answer was the question, so sharply put to him, whether he would allow an irresponsible mass-meeting in a small town to dictate to the general Government what Federal appointees, or what class of them, should be allowed to fill Federal offices. Mr. Roosevelt met this covert attempt at nullification, just as President Cleveland met Debs's in 1894 and Lincoln met South Carolina's in 1861, with the round assertion that the discharge of Federal functions depends, in no part of this Union, upon the whim or consent of a locality.

Senator Spooner, speaking for the Administration, left not a vestige of the case that had laboriously been built up by the opponents of the President's action in the premises. They have said that, with fanatic zeal, or with selfish political motives, he has been trying to force upon a respectable and law-abiding community a postmistress who is personally offensive. Nothing of the kind. He has simply refused to be a party to forcing her out of a national office by local intimidation. It has been said that his uncompromising attitude has imperilled the growing good feeling between North and South, and seriously embarrassed those who are laboring for the negro's real good. But to none of those things did the President look. He saw only the national sovereignty impugned. He saw the Constitutional appointing power usurped, or attempted to be usurped, by a body known to no

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

law, State or National; and he did but his sworn duty in taking the position that a Federal commission must be respected in every part of this country, whether the inhabitants of any particular locality are pleased or displeased.

The essential facts in the Indianola case were put in the Senate debate beyond dispute. Senator McLaurin's version of them did not differ materially from Senator Spooner's. It is agreed on all hands that the postmistress, Mrs. Cox, is an estimable woman personally. She and her husband are well-to-do, owning $10,000 or $15,000 worth of property. She has the respect of the entire community. That is admitted by all. So is it that her conduct of the post-office has been satisfactory. There are absolutely no charges of any kind against her. But a public meeting in Indianola determined that she must be no longer postmistress, and called upon her to resign by a day fixed. Mrs. Cox promised to resign, and did, in fact, soon forward her resignation to Washington; but the President, being fully advised of the facts, and perfectly aware that her action was taken under duress, refused, and still refuses, to accept her forced resignation. Now this woman happens to be colored. But if she were white or yellow or red, Mr. Roosevelt's duty would remain as clear and imperative. He cannot, with due regard to the national dignity or to the Constitution which he has taken an oath to maintain and defend, allow the Federal appointing power to be transferred from President and Senate to a public meeting in a Mississippi town.

Senator McLaurin darkened counsel by many words without wisdom in regard to the right of petition, and the guarantees surrounding peaceable assemblies met to seek redress of grievances. But, granting the grievance—which, in this case, is, confessedly, merely that of a dark skin—to whom was the petition addressed? To any ruler, State or National? To any legislative body whatever? No, but to the postmistress herself. And the particular significance of the "petition" sent to her may best be measured by a resolution introduced at the same public meeting and voted for by a large minority, calling upon a certain Dr. Dudley to leave the town. He was a colored physician who was building up a considerable practice among his own people in Indianola. This was an offence in the eyes of those Southerners who would shut the door of the learned professions to a negro (after boasting that they want to "educate" him) as rigorously as they would public office. At any rate, the hint was enough for Dr. Dudley, and he promptly fled. He knew what was implied in the "petition" addressed to him. It was a thinly veiled threat of ugly consequences to follow if he did not comply. It was precisely the same in Mrs. Cox's case, and she as clearly resigned under threats as did the colored doctor escape for his life. Such outrages upon the private citizen the Government at Washington cannot directly prevent; but if it did not prevent them against its own officers, it would deserve the contempt of all mankind. Once let the principle be established that local prejudice may rightly take upon itself forcibly to vacate a national office, and there is an end of Federal supremacy.

President Roosevelt has chosen an impregnable position. It cannot be carried, and he will not retreat from it. Indianola cannot be allowed to dictate to the United States. This is the simple yet broad issue. "Concede our right to name our postmaster," says the mass meeting in Indianola, "or we will not go to the post-office." "Very well," replies the President of the whole country, "until you submit yourselves to the lawful Federal authority, your post-office will remain closed." That is the whole case. It is not a negro in office, but the national supremacy, that is in question. And surely, the nation with a big N is as properly asserted in its own territory as it is in international diplomacy or throughout the islands of the distant seas. But that is all that President Roosevelt has done. He has simply placed the broad shield of national sovereignty over a member of the Federal Government. The fact that she is a woman, and black, adds to the pathos of the situation, and heightens the chivalrous aspect of the President's act; but the act itself was compelled by the highest considerations of legal and Constitutional right, from which there can be no dissent which does not strike at the heart of the nation's true grandeur.

TAXATION OF MORTGAGES.

In his annual message, Gov. La Follette of Wisconsin makes a long argument in favor of mortgage taxation, and presents nearly all that can be said for that tax. It is an advantage to have all the arguments thus grouped. The advocates of mortgage taxation in this State usually do not care to debate the question. "We know you are right in theory," they declare, when exemption of mortgages is urged upon them, "but our constituents do not understand it, and if we exempted mortgages they would think we were favoring the rich. We appreciate the truth of all you say, but we should not dare to go home and face those who sent us here, if we voted for exemption." Gov. Odell, in advocating a tax of four-tenths of one per cent. on mortgages, takes an equally inconsistent position. A year ago, he declared himself in favor of exempting mortgages. He now endeavors to preserve a formal adherence to that doctrine, while recommending a violation of it. Naturally, no great progress is to be made in that way. Gov. La Follette, however, is evidently sincere in his advocacy of the tax, and he does not lack ability to present the subject as he sees it.

His first point is that mortgages ought to be taxed because, if they are not, capital will invest in them and thus escape taxation. "That vast accumulations of wealth may be invested in interest-bearing securities, insuring large incomes to the holders who throw their share of the expense of maintaining streets, and schools, and public institutions, and all the burdens of municipal and State government upon the owners of factories and shops, and stores, and farms, and homes," he says, "violates every principle of equal rights and equal responsibilities guaranteed to each American citizen." In order to bring the mortgage to the surface, so that it could be assessed, he would have it taxed as an interest in realty, with the provision that if the tax levied is not paid by the owner of the mortgage, it may be paid by the owner of the mortgaged property, and deducted from the amount of the mortgage debt. To avoid the evil of double taxation, he would provide that the owner of the mortgaged real estate should have the valuation of his mortgaged premises reduced by deducting the amount of the mortgage.

Having thus disposed, to his own satisfaction, of two objections—namely, that the tax is practically uncollectible except from mortgages held by the trustees of widows and orphans and dependents, and that a tax on mortgages would constitute double taxation—Gov. La Follette proceeds to consider other criticisms. It is contended, for example, that by agreement or understanding between the maker of the mortgage and the holder, the mortgage tax may be evaded, and rendered a tax on the resources of the borrower. Very well, says the Governor, if this is a danger, make such a contract illegal; prohibit any such agreements. Another objection which he takes up is that the mortgage tax raises the interest rate. "This is disputed," says the Governor, but he fails to say where. Anyhow, he adds:

> "It is unjust to the great body of taxpayers, who are neither lenders nor borrowers, that the hundreds of millions invested in interest-bearing securities should be exempted from taxation in order to establish the lowest possible interest rate. If that is desirable above all things in legislation, it can be attained directly by a law prohibiting the making of a contract for the payment of interest above the desired rate point."

Such is the substance of Gov. La Follette's argument. It may be admitted that he has met some of the objections rather ingeniously; but he certainly has not been able to hide the fact that the tax would be a tax on the borrower, rather than upon the lender. It is all very well to talk about a law prohibiting

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an agreement for the payment of the tax by the mortgageor; he would surely pay it in one form or another. The inability of a law to stand between the borrower and the lender is exhibited every day. It was brought out here in court, a year or two ago, that a certain borrower of $30 had paid in the course of time $300 in interest to the lender, and still owed the original $30. Yet there are usury laws upon the statute-books.

The interest rate on mortgages in this city is 4 or 4½ per cent. It is generally agreed that, but for the fact that mortgages may now be taxed as personal property if the assessor is able to find them, the rate would be at least half of one per cent. lower. Yet the legal rate of interest in this State is 6 per cent. It is obvious that a reduction of the legal rate, say, to 5 per cent., the lowest which has ever been seriously proposed in this State, would have no effect whatever on our mortgage-interest rate here. Besides, if the rate of interest could be arbitrarily lowered and the tax on mortgages then imposed, the result would be, not a large revenue and the collection of a tax on "vast accumulations of wealth," but instead, a withdrawal of money from the mortgage market, to the immediate distress of the borrower. Something of this sort, as is well known, is going on here under our present laws. Trustees and other persons who must make public report of their investments, do not place their money in mortgages, for the very reason that, if they do, the personalty tax will be applied. If this menace were taken away, vast sums would enter the mortgage market, to the certain advantage of the borrower.

The fact is, the mortgage tax is in its very nature a tax which must ultimately be paid by the property on which the mortgage is secured. It does not make any difference how many times the circumference of the circle is traversed, it is still the same circle. The machinery which Gov. La Follette proposes would greatly embarrass the borrower, and would render mortgages extremely unpopular with investors; but the property would still pay the tax. It is possible that, by deducting the amount of the mortgage from the valuation, and then taxing the property on its reduced valuation, and also the mortgage, the burden on a given piece of realty might be divided; but, nevertheless, it would all come back on the land, through an increase of the interest rate. This would be the result, despite all the legislative twisting and turning which Gov. La Follette or anybody else could devise. A successful, equitable tax must be simple, direct, and capable of uniform collection. The mortgage tax has none of these qualities. Such mortgage taxation as we have in this State results in flagrant injustice and but little revenue. The sooner it is wholly done away with the better.

OBSERVATIONS IN A BIG UNIVERSITY.

II.

January, 1903.

The educational problems were not the only ones that Agatha found herself studying. Those that concerned themselves with the life of the students on its social side were even more engrossing. Fraternity life, for instance; a woman could spend half of her life thinking about fraternities. It was the girls' fraternities and their workings that especially interested her. The evils of these seemed so great that it was only by holding the alternatives constantly in mind that she could keep from pulling them down. The only alternatives that suggested themselves to her were girls' dormitories and the ordinary boarding-house. To the former she objected as an attribute of the boarding-school, necessarily involving rules and a modification of the liberty of the individual—a step backwards, as it were. The evils of a co-educational boarding-house were too obvious to need defining. Fraternities were, in their initial idea, superior to either of these institutions, and the tendencies she objected to were not incapable of reform.

In the first place, she groaned in spirit over the waste of time and energy for which false ideas of social duties were responsible. None of the fraternities had any independence, but played follow-the-leader in stupid fashion. If the Beta Gammas or the Upsilon Alphas entertained a visiting celebrity, the Iota Sigmas did the same. Agatha often heard the girls in the fraternity she knew best lamenting the necessity of so much entertaining, but they had not strength of mind enough to accept her suggestion that the necessity was a delusion, the result of an inability to think for themselves. Their crowning argument was that they had been invited to more parties than they had given. Consequently, for at least two days, study was entirely suspended. The vast majority of girls were poor, and the fraternities were run on the most economical lines, with insufficient service and table linen, and a careful scrutiny of every penny.

The day of the reception the girls spent running about to their friends, borrowing glass, china, silver, linen, screens, lamps, tables, chairs, rugs, portières and other articles. They searched the gardens and woods for decorations, which they put up themselves. They arranged the tables, made lemonade, and supplemented the cheap caterer-supplied supper in every possible way. They canvassed the porches and hung Japanese lanterns everywhere. They altered, laundered or even made the gowns they were to wear. By the time the guests arrived they were tired out. After a few hours' sleep they woke the next morning to a topsy-turvy house and a whole day's work in the superficial putting of things in order. The borrowed articles were returned. The hasty, insufficient washing of the one Chinese servant had to be supplemented by a more thorough one before the glass, silver or china could be returned. The worst of the litter was cleared away, but the dust and dirt had to wait for Ah Lee's leisure.

O the stupidity, the silliness of it all! Nobody believed in fun for young people more than Agatha; but was this the way to get it? Was the enjoyment of a big reception in any way adequate to the work involved? And on what basis did the fancied obligation to give it rest? The girls took themselves and their social duties too seriously. A girl in college has no social duties, even if she does live in a fraternity. If receptions happened once a year or even once a term, it would be possible to forgive the waste of time involved; but Agatha knew one fraternity in which they gave three entertainments of various kinds in a single week. One girl spent a whole day making dinner cards for a dinner they gave. At first, Agatha was filled so full of righteous indignation that she would go out of her way to avoid meeting the various members; but soon she found herself pitying their ignorant waste of opportunities and misjudgment of values. And yet she grew indignant again at times, especially when a certain fraternity gave parties, knowing as she did that the girls had no fire, even on the coldest days, but studied huddled up in wraps. In the name of the whole university, she resented the gowns that had taken three or four days to make. A poor girl in college has no right to spend time, strength, and money in such ways. It is a sin against the university, it is a sin against every taxpayer in the State, it is a sin against her instructors and her classmates; it is, above all, a sin against herself.

Besides her moral sense, Agatha's taste was offended by their parties. They were not genuine; they were cheap imitations of more expensive entertainments. The guests were offered watery lemonade, dry sandwiches, milky ice cream, doctored coffee, and salad made of inferior materials. In her delicate, kindly way, Agatha tried once to suggest to the girls that they should give to their guests only perfect coffee and perfect sandwiches of various kinds. But no; the Beta Gammas and the Upsilon Alphas always had salad and ice cream at their parties. If she could only have made them see how greatly first-class calico was to be preferred to cheap satin!

This imitating of the standards of people whose means and opportunities were above their reach was to Agatha one of the greatest evils in fraternity life. The standards they set up were not the standards of the girls' own homes; they were not the standards of simple Western life. There was the matter of chaperoning. The chaperon of one of the fraternities told Agatha that when young men were calling, she sat either in the room or in the next room. This was an innovation that Agatha hated to see, though, on thinking the matter over, she had to acknowledge that it was expedient. The girls in co-educational universities, and especially the girls in fraternities, are so open to criticism that it is well to make sure that there is as little to criticise as possible. Agatha regretted this necessity so greatly that she laid it up against fraternity life. Each of these girls would go home with the chaperon fad, which is the exaggeration of the chaperon need, in her head; she would instil it into her younger sisters, into her own children, thus doing her part towards diminishing the glorious freedom of the American girl—a freedom so little abused as to be the marvel of the rest of the world. The freedom of the American girl is a principle as vital to the social life of the nation as the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Monroe Doctrine is to its political life.

Again it was to the doing away with the accredited schools that Agatha looked for the necessary reforms in fraternity life. This would lead to a smaller proportion of purely frivolous girls. They would be of a higher order of mind, and, consequently, more capable of thinking for themselves. Perhaps then there would be enough strength of mind gathered into one fraternity to start a crusade against the abuses of fraternity life. They would decree no parties that involved great preparations or pretence of any kind; no expenditure that was out of keeping with their daily living; nothing that was not simple and informal. They would decide, too, that their time was too valuable to be spent in dressing in their best clothes and making calls with card cases in their hands; they would receive the canon that the duties of a girl to society do not begin until after she leaves college. They would establish the law that their house was to be kept quiet except at certain times; that each member was to respect the work of the others.

The problems that concerned themselves with athletics troubled Agatha little. It was quickly obvious to her, as to any thinking person, that the benefits of athletics were so great that even the abuses of it were to be cheerfully borne. The consequent improvement in the health of the students was the least of these. No individual sacrifices, even where they concerned themselves with life and death, were too costly for a pursuit that had made abstemiousness a manly virtue and had set the fashion of temperance for a whole generation. No other power had ever succeeded in propping up weakness of will or in making the saying of *no* an easy thing. Agatha's father and uncles had gone to college in the old days when drinking, playing pranks, and making love were the only amusements of collegians, when superfluous spirits had to be worked off in such ways as conducting donkeys to the top of steeples; and from their stories she could realize what athletics had done for the moral tone of the college world. In all her life at Westerley, she never but once saw a student drunk.

The much agitated subject of co-education was naturally a great deal in Agatha's mind. Theoretically, she approved of it as a characteristic American institution. It was on a line with development in accordance with such American traditions as were factors in the evolution of that interesting and significant product, the American girl. That she never found herself in absolute sympathy with it in fact was, she decided, because of other modifying forces in the university that had practically no connection with co-education. What seemed to the superficial observer the evils of co-education were actually due to other causes—to the fact that the university was the culmination of the public-school system, to the class from which so many of the students come. The objectionable freedom of manner of many of the boys and girls was not due to their attending the same lectures and studying side by side in the library. Those boys and girls would have the same manners under any conditions. Co-education could never be fairly tested unless boys and girls from the classes that went to Harvard and Bryn Mawr were sent to college together. We had no right to compare the boys and girls that went to a free university with the boys and girls that went to expensive colleges, and then lay the deficiencies at the door of co-education. The advantages of the one class had, generally speaking, been vastly superior to those of the other. And so, when Agatha saw, as she frequently did, relations to be criticised between the boys and girls, she always tried to imagine the individual in his or her native environment, with the result of confirming her in the opinion that co-education is the scapegoat for much that it does not deserve.

Her strongest objection was based on the remembrance of her own feelings, knowing as she did that the boys would have been much more interesting to her than her books; but on the other hand, she always found herself remembering absorbing devotions of her own to various girls in her college days, as well as the numerous love affairs of her friends with the college men whom they met in the vacations. It is a necessity of that age to adore somebody. A certain amount of time and attention would go in dreaming under any circumstances, and no woman of insight would wish to curtail this, with the realization upon her of the limitations of the man or woman who has never been in love. What astonished Agatha, however, was not the extent to which they fell in love, but the apparent ease with which they seemed to keep out of it. She knew numbers of students, both boys and girls, who were apparently heart whole. If they had secret divinities, there were no signs of worship. She marvelled at this, remembering the days when, for stress of feeling, she could neither eat nor sleep.

The stock argument that co-education takes the bloom off a girl, that it "commonizes" her in the eyes of men by destroying the mystery, was always offensive to Agatha, as coming from an unenlightened point of view. If a woman is to be loved and admired in proportion as she is not known, what chance has she for happiness in married life when all mystery is made manifest? Such a theory implies that the mutual relations of men and women are to be intermittent, vague, shadowy. The only safe foundation for happiness in marriage is actual knowledge, and the reverence that rests merely on a delusion is better done away with. If a woman has not that in her that demands reverence, no doubt the deficiency will be discovered in the daily intercourse of the classroom. If the mystery is merely a trick, not an emanation of depth of character, it will surely be exposed. Four years of classroom life give a man a chance to learn to know women such as he seldom gets. Agatha's experience led her to conclude that the question of sex had little influence in the classroom, however much it might have outside. The boys and girls did not seem to meet there as boys and girls, merely as students. Her observation was confirmed by that of other people, though theirs sometimes implied a criticism: co-education would lessen the mutual interest of men and women. This objection was simply funny to Agatha, and set her wondering about the internal mechanism of the people who made it. Was there really any manner of device in heaven or earth that would lessen the all-absorbing mutual interest of men and women?

At all events, in State universities, co-education, as well as size, is a necessity, owing to the excessive cost of equipment to meet modern demands. The question before us now is not whether separate education or smaller institutions are preferable, but what is the best manner of modifying or overcoming the evils due to diversity and size.

ELIZABETH KNIGHT TOMPKINS.

A WINTER EXHIBITION OF LANDSCAPE AT THE ROYAL ACADEMY.

LONDON, January 5, 1903.

The winter exhibition at the Royal Academy comes so near being a triumphant success this year that its failure is the more irritating. The Academicians, unexpectedly lighting upon a good idea, have not known what to do with it. Already, a few years ago, they were faced with the danger of exhausting the supply of old masters in the country, and the consequent necessity of providing some new interest to their winter exhibition. One way out of the difficulty that occurred to them was to rely less upon the splendor of individual pictures than upon the characteristic representation of some one painter, or school, or period; and indeed few plans, if successfully carried out, would be more useful to the student. But they have played with the idea, instead of realizing it seriously and completely as a body of their influence and wealth could and should. One winter they showed incidentally a few pictures by the Barbizon men; another, the work of Fred Walker, Mason, Cecil Lawson—would-be English Romanticists. Last year they got together a superb collection of Claudes, the true foundation of the English school; and the result is that now, when they undertake to make a special representation of English landscape, it is impossible to do more than borrow indiscriminately from different collectors and galleries, and hang without any attempt at order a few fine examples of the great English masters of landscape.

It may be said that if they have done this they have done a great deal, and that one masterpiece counts for more than the most perfect historical sequence and intelligent hanging. True, and, indeed, the glory of the Wilsons and Turners, the Constables, Cotmans, and Cromes in the first two rooms would silence criticism forever if the exhibition began and ended with them. But, unfortunately, its organizers have gone further and aimed at historical sequence. They have endeavored to suggest the foreign inspiration of the English landscape that began, in full perfection, with Wilson; they have endeavored also to follow the fortunes of English landscape down to the present day. Claude, having figured so largely a year ago, could not appear again so soon without an effect of repetition, and, as a substitute, no one better was forthcoming than Cuyp, to whose landscapes, together with a slight sprinkling of his portraits, an entire room is devoted.

Few of the Dutch painters are so tedious as Cuyp. Occasionally, in Amsterdam and at The Hague, one chances upon a picture by him that seems, in its straightforward and honest study of light, to justify his reputation. But it must be confessed that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the average Cuyp is, on the face of it, nothing better than a pot-boiler, and the result of seeing so many together is disastrous. One leaves the gallery more firmly convinced than ever that his famous golden light, his sky—above all, his clouds—are as much studio properties as his cattle and cowherds and cavaliers. Besides, if he influenced any one, it was not Wilson and the succeeding masters, but the English painters who are best forgotten. Some of his "cattle pieces" look like glorified editions of Sydney Cooper, the painter whose great old age made him the popular hero of recent summer Academies, though, now he is dead, he is not thought worthy a place in a winter exhibition of landscape. But when it comes to the moderns who are represented, and upon whom two rooms are wasted, the result is a still worse disaster.

Only four are included, Brett, Henry Moore, Vicat Cole, and Ridley Corbet, and the reason for their inclusion is no sympathy of aims, absolutely no relation to the great masters of the early half of the nineteenth century, but merely the fact that they all happen to have died within recent years. Nor are the steps leading to the degeneracy for which they stand in any way explained in the absence of the men whose works would be so many links in the long chain connecting Wilson with the painters of to-day. How, from Constable, there was ever evolved Vicat Cole, for example, would be hard to understand were it not for a big landscape by Linnell, who came so near being a good painter that one is the more conscious how lamentably he fell short of it. But his "Storm in Harvest," a large and ambitious work, is here, and it explains much. In the distance is a wide, undulating plain under the shadow of the storm, well generalized, with a truth and dignity that suggest careful study of Constable; in the foreground is a corn-field (with figures), which, in all its commonplace detail, would not be unworthy of Vicat Cole. Perhaps it is really because this picture does explain so much that it is banished to the last room of all opened, apparently to no better end than to provide a lodging for the odds and ends that had to be crowded in somehow, out of compliment to the collectors who lent them.

These, then, are the faults of the exhibition: failure in the attempted historical sequence and arrangement, and a preponderance of the work of second and third-rate men that might more profitably have been omitted. The great merit is in the beauty of the paintings by the little group of masters. Wilson, undeniably, was the follower, the student of Claude, but he was the inspired student, and his canvases could well stand the test of comparison to which Turner, though less qualified, exposed his own on the walls of the National Gallery. Wilson, like Claude, always sought and found in nature a certain convention—the convention we now call classical. But it never blinded his eyes to natural beauty, while it taught him the value of expressing this beauty in rhythmical lines and well-balanced masses. And he too helped to "set the sun" in the heavens. The most characteristic of his landscapes now shown is his "Apollo and the Seasons," the figures merely the detail that Claude had already made them, that Corot was to make them later, in a perfect landscape where the lake and its tranquil shores, the hills and inevitable temple, are filled with a glory of light that the experiments, based on chemical truths, of the scientific painter have as yet failed to rival. But Wilson's convention did not mean sacrifice of all character. He could adapt it to his subject so that when, as in "Woburn Abbey," he left the Italy he loved or the land that existed only in his imagination, for a purely English scene, he could still weave his lines into perfect rhythm, make trees and hills part of a well-ordered design, and yet be absolutely true in the English quality of light and atmosphere, the English character of tree forms, wooded slopes, and architecture.

If Turner in his later work was more daringly original, never in his excursions into heretofore untouched problems of light was he at once so accomplished and so really splendid as in the landscapes and marines painted when the conventions inherited from Claude and Wilson kept him within bounds. His masterpieces at the Academy now are his "Harlech," first exhibited in 1799, complete in itself and free from the detail of later pictures that may have meant much to Ruskin but mean nothing in his compositions, serene with the serenity never yet achieved by mere experiment, however clever; and his dramatic "Boats carrying out Anchors and Cables to Dutch Men-of-War in 1665," dating back to 1804, with the wonderful movement of the water, the action of the boat emerging from the very trough of the sea, and the tragedy of nature under the heavy, purple-black canopy of the storm-cloud. It is before pictures like these that one takes off the hat to the master, rather than before the "Modern Italy," into which he strove to paint an entire country on a single canvas, or "The Approach to Venice," which, brilliant as it may once have been, has suffered the fate of so many of his pictures, and is now probably but a pale phantom of itself.

A number of Constables are shown, most of them too well known to call for description. But, no doubt by chance, the two that have become the most familiar through frequent repetition or reproduction have been hung just where they best help to emphasize the weakness and strength of the painter. I have always thought "The Rainbow," more often called "Salisbury Cathedral," the most unsatisfactory of all the large Constables—its foreground overloaded with the detail of the water and the reeded banks, the horse and cart dragged through the stream, the odd figures—while the picture itself, when you finally get beyond the foreground to the cathedral and its surroundings, is involved in composition and disturbed by the glittering dots which were Constable's means for obtaining desired effects of light. The canvas now is close to Wilson's tranquil "Apollo and the Seasons," and to contrast the two landscapes is to realize only what was lost when Constable abandoned convention for a more exact rendering of nature. But then, on the other hand, the most satisfactory of the large Constables is the "Dedham Lock, or the Leaping Horse," and it hangs next to Gainsborough's "Fallen Tree." There are other Gainsboroughs, but I have said nothing of them, for not one quite accounts for his own preference for his landscapes, though I have seen, elsewhere, several that do. As for "The Fallen Tree," it seems in its present place for no better reason than to show what was gained when Constable, throwing over all the old stock-in-trade of the studio—brown tree, ruins, withered branches, and the rest—went straight to nature, where, sometimes, he found a beautiful composition ready-made as at Dedham Lock. Gainsborough's canvas is but a flat, not particularly lovely pattern, compared with this fine, open countryside, bathed in light, enveloped in air, where the wind blows the clouds and masses of foliage into long, beautiful flowing lines, and the figures are in their appointed place, not because tradition required them just there, but because Constable thus saw horse and boy taking the spirited leap, of which he has caught the action and the feeling so marvellously. And, full of incident as the canvas is, the relation of the different passages is so right, the "sparkle with repose" at which Constable aimed is given so perfectly, that the picture both sanctions his ambition as a "natural painter," and preserves the harmonious tone and noble serenity of Wilson's convention. Constable did not often, in his large landscapes, reach this high point of achievement. Directly opposite is his "Opening of Waterloo Bridge," with its restless, overcrowded foreground, and utter failure to render or suggest the majesty of St. Paul's towering over all London in the distance—a picture that goes far to confirm one in a growing doubt as to whether Delacroix and the other Frenchmen did not overestimate the genius of Constable. It is really in his smaller sketches and studies—and a few are here—that he more nearly realized his own high conceptions of the ends and aims of landscape.

What the French Romanticists did was to demonstrate the value of generalization, of concentration, of unity in a landscape. The English painters, even the greatest, were apt to try to put too much into one canvas—far more than one canvas can possibly hold—and this despite Crome's enlightened doctrine of the necessity of "seeing the whole picture at a glance." It is the defect in Cotman's big "St. Malo," which consists of three distinct compositions—the town to the left, the sea to the right, the group of fishing-boats (the ingenious connecting link) in the centre. The eye wanders from one to the other without ever receiving any impression of a pictorial whole. And yet there were times when Cotman, disdaining to make any concession to methods in vogue, did not allow himself to stray from one fine central motive, and then he created the masterpiece; for instance, the noble "Homeward Bound," where the ship that sails toward you from out of the sunset fills the canvas. And what a sunset!. Turner, in his sensational skies, sometimes amazes you so by the means that you lose sight of the effect they were to produce. But Cotman lets you see nothing, feel nothing, but the glory of the sombre golden light tinged with flame, out of which his splendid ship comes sailing, laden with romance. This picture is an exception, however. Cotman was far oftener bewildered by light and color, and his "Heath Scene," though well composed, is too hot to be pleasant.

Crome, here certainly, seems more matter-of-fact by Cotman's side, but his two versions of "Mousehold Heath," if not as

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

masterly as the third in the National Gallery, are so full of the life and animation of nature, so successfully painted "for air and space," so true in the relation of their planes, so brought into unity of aspect, and therefore of tone, by the all-enveloping light and atmosphere, that they make me, at least, wonder more than ever why the great English traditions of landscape should have all but perished in the modern Academical slough of commonplace. Bonington is not particularly well represented. The two surprises of the exhibition are a little romantic woodland scene by Reynolds, the first and only landscape by him I have seen, and a fine stretch of plain and hillside that shows De Wint almost rivalling Wilson in dignity, tranquillity, and sobriety of vision. After this, a few indifferent David Coxes, and one or two large canvases by William Müller, that look like Constables gone mad, bring the collection of landscapes down to the moderns, upon whom space need not be wasted—except, perhaps, to point out that the complete emptiness of Henry Moore's marines, when seen in company with that magnificent Turner, make one appreciate more fully than ever the low standard of the summer Academy, where these same paintings used to seem almost distinguished.

There are other pictures, by old masters, that are not landscapes or marines, but they have the air of having been dragged in to fill up the walls and not disappoint a public that dislikes nothing more than change or innovation in either its winter or summer Academy. The most important are the two large Tintorettos from Hampton Court, the "Nine Muses in Olympus," and "Esther Fainting before Ahasuerus"; and it is interesting to see them where they really can be seen. A Rembrandt, a Rubens, and a Franz Hals, lent by Mr. Pierpont Morgan, are a new argument in favor of the proposal made in the *Nation* recently for a training school for art collectors. The Hals, the portrait of a woman, is the best of the three, and there are fine passages in it; but it shows Hals in his more perfunctory, less animated moments. Some of the portraits by Reynolds, the celebrated Mrs. Pelham feeding her chickens, and the Countess of Powis, are charming. But a couple of Romneys are of indifferent merit, and altogether this part of the collection could have been dispensed with.

More superfluous still—that is, as a section of the regular Academy exhibition—is the series of drawings, photographs, and so on illustrative of Mr. Arthur Evans's excavations in Crete, arranged in a room quite apart. The series is of enormous interest, as every one knows who has followed the researches that have brought the Labyrinth to light. But simply because the series is so interesting, it should not be treated as a mere side-show, which, it may safely be said, the great majority of visitors to the exhibition will never enter. N. N.

Correspondence.

LYNCH LAW ONCE MORE.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: A year ago, on the appearance in the *Atlantic Monthly* of an article in which the originator of lynch law was identified with Charles Lynch of Virginia, I wrote to the author saying that he had not given proof of such identification and asking for further facts. I received a courteous reply, but not the needed proof. About the same time was published the Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1900, containing a monograph on "Sectionalism and Representation in South Carolina," in which, in reference to the Regulators of 1768, it was stated that "the settlers agreed to rely on lynch law, which received its name at this time" (i. 337). To the author of this monograph I also wrote, saying that I knew of no facts which would lead to such a conclusion, and asking for his authority. From his reply it appeared that the author had relied too implicitly on his memory, and that Gregg, by whom he thought the statement had been made, so far from asserting that the *term* arose during the Regulator movement in South Carolina, had merely said that "they called themselves 'Regulators,' and thus 'Lynch law' had its origin at this period" ('Hist. of the Old Cheraws,' 1867, p. 128). Eight years earlier Dr. R. W. Gibbes had written: "The Regulation, an association of respectable planters, took the matter in hand, and enforced order by a system of Lynch law" (in J. B. O'Neall's 'Biog. Sketches of the Bench and Bar of S. C.,' vol. i., p. x.).

Having, therefore, done something towards relieving both Charles Lynch and South Carolina from the odium of unproved charges, I was somewhat chagrined to find that Gen. McCrady (*Nation*, January 15) had so far misunderstood my previous letter (*Nation*, December 4, 1902) as to speak of my "apparent inclination to find in the action of the Regulators on Lynch's Creek the origin of the term lynch law." In that letter my aim was to give as many facts and as few opinions as possible; and the only personal opinions I was conscious of expressing were: (1) that no one of the conjectures as to the origin of the term "is wholly satisfactory"; (2) that the *Atlantic* writer "assumes but does not prove the connection between Charles Lynch and lynch law"; and (3) that the derivation of the term from Lynch's Creek "has yet to be proved." General McCrady feels quite sure that "nothing to connect the term 'Lynch Law' with that of 'Regulation' or 'Regulators' in Carolina will ever be found." While I hesitate to commit myself so unequivocally, not knowing what future research may yield, yet certainly nothing of the sort has yet been found.

But while it is pleasant to find myself in agreement with General McCrady on this point, one statement made by him cannot be allowed to pass unchallenged. He says: "It is not until 1841, as appears by Mr. Matthews's collection, that the two terms [lynch law and regulator] are found together, and then they are used in regard to affairs in Texas and Arkansas." Space forbade my giving more than a few of the many extracts before me, and naturally those were chosen which best showed the changes in meaning which lynch law had undergone. The terms "regulating" and "regulator," sometimes by themselves and sometimes in connection with lynch law, turn up before 1841.

"These regulators are self-appointed ministers of justice, to punish or destroy those whom the law cannot touch." 1819, Dec. 16, W. Faux, *Memorable Days in America* (1823), p. 318. Faux had spoken on Nov. 26 of "Lynch's law," and was now alluding to "the Rowdies of Kentucky."

"On such occasions therefore, all the quiet and industrious men of a district form themselves into companies, under the name of 'Regulators.' They appoint officers, put themselves under their orders, and bind themselves to assist and stand by each other." 1824, W. N. Blane, *Excursion through the U. S. and Canada*, p. 234. Though Blane does not employ the term lynch law, yet he describes the practice.

"No commentator has taken any notice of *Lynch's Law;* . . . the citizens formed themselves into a '*regulating company.*' . . . Sometimes the sufferers resorted to courts of justice for remuneration, and there have been instances of heavy damages being recovered of the *regulators.*" 1828, Judge J. Hall, *Letters from the West*, pp. 291, 292.

"The Regulators, as they were called, I have every reason to believe, were an eminently useful race of men, and it may be maintained in most cases, just, withal." 1835, C. J. Latrobe, *Rambler in America* (1836), i. 96. Latrobe is speaking of Kentucky.

In my former letter I merely pointed out that the terms "regulating," "regulation," and "regulator" were in use in the Carolinas in 1768, that illegal whippings were at that time inflicted by the Regulators, and that a meeting of the Regulators took place at Lynch's Creek. Whether there is any historical connection between the Regulators of the Carolinas and the regulators who flourished along the frontiers in and after 1819, is one of the many obscure points in the early history of lynch law which await elucidation. Albert Matthews.

Boston, January 18, 1903.

EDUCATIONAL DIVERSITY.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In the *Nation* of December 11, I read with much interest an editorial, under the title "Educational Diversity," which seemed to me particularly sound and well-timed. It appears somewhat remarkable that the iconoclasts of late breaking into the midst of our educational ideals and idols of culture should be generally those entrusted with their care, and that, among the protestants most earnest and interested, should be found in the lead those who have been often regarded as the most dangerous enemies of liberal forms of education.

The fact would seem to be that the foremost universities and the most justly famous colleges are yielding too completely to the pressure for a revolutionized curriculum. While it may be true that Greek constituted a "college fetish" when Charles Francis Adams delivered his immortal philippic, it certainly was, and remains, true that Greek constitutes, just as much as in the days of Horace Mann and Francis Wayland, an ideal linguistic and intellectual discipline and a noble source of moral power. For the man of leisure, and for the scholar, it has just as much value as ever, and its importance in the education of these men is quite as great as it was adjudged to be by the greatest educators of the last generation. The same is true of Latin, in its field, with the further argument in its favor that it is an element of fundamental importance in a larger number of educations, as in law, in medicine, and in philology and pedagogy, and in natural science. The need of the day is not that the old

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

curriculum of the "liberal" education should be abolished, but that the spirit of tolerance which has come so largely to pervade theological spheres should become characteristic of the educational world, and that it should not only be admitted that there are and should be many educations, but also that they should be provided as a part of the system of educations which modern life demands and which the modern state should furnish. We want many new educations; but we need and should sacredly preserve the old—even the "classical." The pendulum is, as usual, swinging too far.

In the view of one who has been a pioneer, and who has surrendered a working lifetime to the promotion of some of the needed new educations, some serious mistakes have been made in the course of this later evolution in education. The giving of A.B. for all courses, and in every form of academic education, seems a radical and unnecessary departure from the older and more logical custom of giving A.B. to the student of the ancient classical course, Ph.B. to the scholar making philosophy his distinguishing work, B.Sc. to the worker in science, and B.L. to the man aspiring to high rank in letters. The pendulum will probably swing back, in time, to its normal arc—an arc suited to the times.

The movement, now so threatening, favoring a two-year or a three-year college curriculum seems another of these extravagant efforts at meeting a demand which is misunderstood by those upon whom the demand is made. Carried to its logical result, it would abolish all college educations because some able and honest business men declare that, for the purpose of money-making simply, the years of college life are less valuable than the same years spent in the shop, the office or the field. They are probably wrong; but, if right, give the ambitious and intellectually strong young man his choice. He will probably choose an education, and will later prove its value and the error of the now favorably received proposition. We are here sending out a hundred young men every year to disprove that fallacy—and they are doing it—in a single branch of professional college work. The college man is often at a disadvantage for a time; but if made of the right stuff, in the end (other things being equal) he usually marches in the van. It is along his chosen line among the various educations now offered by the larger institutions of learning that the poor boy, as always, is more and more frequently finding his way to the front, even in departments of business which are considered least dependent upon learning, scientific or other, for prosperity.

It is unquestionably very desirable that every professional man should also be an "educated" man. In these days he *must* be professionally educated, to succeed. It is also important that he should have as "complete and generous" an education, as Milton would say, as he can afford. But it would be a supreme injustice to assert, and to enforce, the dictum that the man who cannot afford a "liberal" education preliminarily to his professional training, should be forever barred from the profession. That would be a cruel and shameful injustice. It is entirely proper that the acquirement of all the education that time and means permit should be advised every aspirant to professional life; but neither expediency nor justice dictates compulsion or exclusion.

Neither should the course be shortened for all. This latter problem is, in fact, comparatively easy of solution. Let the student, in his A.B. work, elect all the mathematics, the languages, the science, and the special subjects, apart from the professional, that may be properly brought into his course. He will cover a very large fraction of the essential, though non-professional, work of the professional course. He will then secure his A.B. in the usual and proper form and time, and may next obtain his professional degree in two or, at most, three years. We have many men taking this course, and usually securing a reduction of one-third in the length of the normal total college period, and the equivalent, in this respect, of the arrangement proposed by the most radical of advocates of the dwarfing of the A.B. course.

R. H. THURSTON.

ITHACA, N. Y., January 20, 1903.

BROWNING'S NEGLECT OF ENGLISH SCENERY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It is somewhat remarkable that so able a critic as Mr. Stopford Brooke, in speaking of Browning's neglect of English scenery, should have overlooked a passage which, for vivid description of that serene and restful beauty so characteristic of "England's best," might alone establish for its author a high rank among "Earth's praisers."

Of the description in "The Inn Album" of an English elm-tree, Mr. Brooke says: "[This] is interesting because it is the third, and only the third, reference to English scenery in the multitude of Browning's verses. The first is in 'Pauline,' the second is that poem, 'O, to be in England,' and this is the third." He then proceeds to quote from "The Inn Album":

"The woman never once has ceased to gaze
On the great elm-tree in the open, posed
Placidly full in front, smooth bole, broad branch,
And leafage one green plenitude of May.
. . . . . bosomful
Of lights and shades, murmurs and silences,
Sun-warmth, dew-coolness—squirrel, bee, and bird,
High, higher, highest, till the blue proclaims
'Leave earth, there's nothing better till next step Heavenward!'"

The passage which Mr. Stopford Brooke has omitted from his enumeration of Browning's tributes to English nature, is, to my mind, the most beautiful of all, and it is found in the same poem. It may well speak for itself:

"So much describes the stuffy little room—
Vulgar, flat, smooth respectability:
Not so the burst of landscape surging in,
Sunrise and all, as he who of the pair
Is, plain enough, the younger personage
Draws sharp the shrieking curtain, sends aloft
The sash, spreads wide and fastens back to wall
Shutter and shutter, shows you England's best.
He leans into a living glory-bath
Of air and light where seems to float and move
The wooded watered country, hill and dale
And steel-bright thread of stream, a-smoke with mist,
A-sparkle with May morning, diamond drift
O' the sun-touched dew. Except the red-roofed patch
Of half a dozen dwellings that, crept close
For hill-side shelter, make the village clump
This inn is perched above to dominate—
Except such sign of human neighborhood
(And this surmised rather than sensible),
There's nothing to disturb absolute peace,
The reign of English nature."

Could any words be chosen more effectively to portray the English landscape? We feel the inrush of light and freshness in contrast with the little stuffy inn-parlor. We lean into the "glory-bath of light and air," and, with the poet, we get such a view of an English landscape that, if we have not forgotten our visits to the mother country, we find ourselves exclaiming, in Browning's own words, "Oh to be in England—in England now!"

Yours respectfully, M. G. M.

BALTIMORE, January 23, 1903.

Notes.

Macmillan's spring announcements include 'A History of the United States since the Civil War,' volume i., by William Garrott Brown; 'A History of the Confederate War,' by George Cary Eggleston; 'The Impeachment and Trial of Andrew Johnson,' by David M. DeWitt; 'A Few of Hamilton's Letters,' selected by Gertrude Atherton; 'Historical Lectures by the Late Lord Acton,' in two volumes; 'Biographical Sketches,' by James Bryce; 'Queen Victoria: A Biography,' by Sidney Lee; 'The Life of Charlotte M. Yonge,' by Christabel R. Coleridge; 'The Life of Sir George Grove,' by C. L. Graves; 'The Life of the Late Lord Bishop of Durham,' by his son, the Rev. Arthur Westcott. From the Cambridge Historical Series we select 'The Colonization of South America,' by E. J. Payne. In the English Men of Letters Series every title is of interest: 'Crabbe,' by Alfred Ainger; 'Jane Austen,' by H. C. Beeching; 'Browning,' by G. K. Chesterton; 'Hobbes,' by Sir Leslie Stephen; 'Lowell,' by Dr. Henry van Dyke; 'Emerson,' by Professor Woodberry; 'Franklin,' by Owen Wister. In this connection belong also the second volume of Prof. William Ridgeway's 'Early Age of Greece,' and Sir James H. Ramsay's 'Angevin Empire: the Reigns of Henry II., Richard I., and John.' Another class opens with Sir Walter Besant's 'London in the Eighteenth Century'; 'Greater Russia,' by Wirt Gerrare; 'Poland,' by George Brandes; 'Letters from the Holy Land,' by Lady Butler (Elizabeth Thompson); 'Quebec: The Place and the People,' by Sir Gilbert Parker; 'The Island of Formosa,' by James W. Davidson, United States Consul there; 'Italy,' by Prof. W. Deecke. From the outing works we take 'Photography for the Sportsman Naturalist,' by W. E. Carlin. 'The Illustrated History of American Art,' to be edited by Prof. John C. Van Dyke, will comprise 'Sculpture,' by Lorado Taft; 'Painting,' by Samuel Isham; and 'Music,' by Louis C. Elson. Our countryman, Dr. Charles Waldstein, will treat of 'Art in the Nineteenth Century.' Drs. Garnett and Gosse's 'Illustrated History of English Literature' will start off with volumes i. (from earliest times to 1500) and iii. (from Milton to Johnson). Add: 'A Lexicon to the Poetical Works of John Milton,' by Laura A. Lockwood, of Wellesley College; 'The Age of Shakspere,' by Thomas Secombe and J. W. Allen; 'The Moral System of Shakspere,' by Prof. Richard G. Moulton; 'Representative English Comedies,' edited by Prof. Charles Mills Gayley of the University of California; 'The Works of Edward FitzGerald,' edited by W. Aldis Wright, in seven volumes, limited to 250 sets (the letters, by the way, arranged in chronological order, and no longer in groups), and sold only by subscription. Finally, we will mention, with the story not half told, 'Heredity and Social Progress,' by Prof. Simon

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

N. Patten; 'Railway Legislation in the United States,' by Balthasar H. Meyer; 'Custom and Competition,' by Prof. Richard T. Ely; 'A History of American Theories,' by C. Edwards Merriam; a new edition of Prof. Lucy M. Salmon's 'History of the Appointing Power,' with 'History: Suggestions as to its Story and Teaching,' by the same writer; 'Irrigation Institutions: A Discussion of the Economic and Legal Questions Created by the Growth of Irrigated Agriculture in the West,' by Elwood Mead; 'Climatology,' from the German of Prof. Julius Hann; 'The Story of Rome as Greeks and Romans Tell It,' by George Willis Botsford and Lillie Shaw Botsford; 'Happiness: Essays on the Meaning of Life,' by Prof. Carl Hilty of Bern; 'Yesterday's Madness,' a new novel by Alfred Hodder; and 'The People of the Whirlpool,' by the author of 'The Garden of a Commuter's Wife.'

Early in March, Harper & Bros. will have ready Mrs. Humphry Ward's 'Lady Rose's Daughter.'

Little, Brown & Co. have in preparation 'The Indians of the Painted Desert Region,' by George Wharton James.

A handbook, 'Money and Banking,' by Prof. Wm. A. Scott of the University of Wisconsin, designed for educational purposes or for private reading, will be published immediately by Henry Holt & Co.

Forthcoming from the Baker & Taylor Co. are 'Pictorial Composition and the Critical Judgment of Pictures,' by H. R. Poore; 'With the Trees,' by Maud Going; and 'My Woodland Inmates,' by Mrs. Effie Bignell.

'The New America,' a study of the imperial republic, by Beckles Willson, is in the press of E. P. Dutton & Co.

'Among the Palms,' life along the Atlantic Coast, by Nina Larré Duryea, will be issued by J. F. Taylor & Co.

Duckworth & Co., London, invite subscriptions to 'Chelsea Old Church,' by Randall Davies, in a limited edition. It will contain much unrecorded Chelsea history, both of the church and of the principal houses in the old village. There will be thirteen illustrations, including Holbein's drawing of the More family at Chelsea, 1527, now at Basle. The fifth and sixth chapters are given up to More and his property and its subsequent owners for two centuries. Genealogical data abound.

The architectural details of an English village church often yield the most unexpected pleasure. The church at Ickford, diocese of Oxford, is an instance in point. It is very ancient, and an uncommonly fine specimen of the early English work of the beginning of the thirteenth century. The tower is probably unique, with its saddleback roof and very beautiful windows. Unhappily, being in a region hard hit by agricultural depression, this little church is in such woful disrepair that he who would see it must be quick about the matter. Only $2,000 of the $8,500 required to preserve it from collapse have so far been subscribed, although the University of Oxford has been generous, moved, no doubt, by the fact that Archbishop Sheldon, who built the Sheldonian Theatre at Oxford, was once Rector of Ickford. Americans have at least a sentimental interest in the preservation of such beautiful country church models as England still contains. It is therefore worth recording, perhaps, that contributions may be sent to G. Bennett, Esq., Tiddington House, Oxford.

A third, revised edition of Robert S. Barrett's 'Standard Guide to the City of Mexico and Vicinity' is announced by the Modern Mexico Publishing Co. of this city.

There is little change in the twelfth edition of Baedeker's 'Northern Italy,' which reaches us through the Scribners; nor was much change required in this sterling handbook. Here and there the text has been retouched; the latest surmises of the Morellians are duly recorded in the paragraphs on the paintings at Florence, Venice, and Milan; and up-to-dateness again appears in the lines on the fall of the Venetian Campanile. A slight mechanical improvement is the glazing of the thin red covers, which gives stiffness and presumably greater resistance to wear and tear.

With the appearance of the third part of H. Inigo Triggs's 'Formal Gardens in England and Scotland' (London: Batsford; New York: Scribners) that excellent work is brought to completion. As we pointed out in a notice of the first part, the book shows, by means of a series of studies of some of the most complete of the historic gardens remaining in the British Islands, the principle involved in their planning and in their arrangement in relation to the house. The distinguishing note of the book is the admirable series of plans and bird's-eye views of gardens drawn by the author. Collections of photographs of English gardens are now fortunately within the reach of all, but no collection is accompanied by plans which approach in clearness and accuracy those made by Mr. Triggs. The drawings and photographs of the third part are accompanied by text descriptive of the houses and gardens to which the work is devoted. These notes are of sufficient length to bring out whatever is essential to an understanding of the drawings, but they avoid the wearisome historical details which so frequently encumber descriptions of old English houses.

It strikes us that the time and pains spent by Mr. T. F. Thiselton-Dyer in producing 'Royalty in All Ages' (London: John C. Nimmo; New York: Scribners), a collection of anecdotes and gossip of the whims, follies, superstitions, amusements, etc., of royal personages, might, even though the sources drawn upon are accessible and familiar, have been better employed. Still, there are readers who make their literary repasts on the principle favored by Little Jack Horner; and these, no doubt, will find this book entertaining. A little more care in its preparation would not have been amiss. Typographical errors can be saddled, we suppose, on the proof-reader; but such a phrase as "the grace and popularity which marked her early but ill-fated life"; the repeated references to Frederick II. of Prussia as "the Emperor"; the statement that King James's alleged *menu* for the devil's dinner is to be found in his 'Counterblaste,' seem to be mere carelessness. The book is embellished with six handsome etched portraits "from contemporary engravings." We should extremely like to know something more about the contemporary engravings of Edward I. and Edward III.

In 'The Lords Baltimore and the Maryland Palatinate,' by Clayton Colman Hall (Baltimore: John Murphy Co.), originally a series of lectures delivered by request before the Maryland Society of the Colonial Dames of America, we have not only brief biographies of the Proprietaries, but also a succinct history of the Province down to the Revolution. Besides being agreeably written, this work is extremely accurate, the author, with a conscientiousness which we wish were possessed by all writers in this field, having gone to original and authentic sources for his statements of fact, and having no bias or prejudice, religious or other. The only inaccuracy which an attentive reading has discovered is the statement on page 156, that the dispute about the western boundary was settled in 1852. It is true that in that year commissioners from Maryland and Virginia agreed upon a line, but Virginia never ratified their report as the act required, and the question is now in litigation before the Supreme Court. We can commend this little book to all who are interested in our colonial histories.

Mr. E. W. Kemp's 'History for Graded and District Schools' (Ginn & Co.) is a book which follows a somewhat unusual plan. Beginning in a very simple strain with the infancy of the Aryans, it advances from grade to grade until, in the last chapter, which deals with the development of the American nation, it addresses minds of considerable maturity. There are eight grades, and the book seeks to provide for the historical needs of "children from six to about fifteen years of age." Whether a single small volume will supply all the reading that a young enthusiast demands, may be called a doubtful question; but if we once admit that most school children are not enthusiastic historians, another complexion is put upon the matter. Mr. Kemp says: "The effort has been made to present the material in such connection throughout the grades that it would gradually develop in pupils' minds the idea of the *unity of history*, and then finally lead them to feel that history is an unbroken stream of life, of which the present in general and their lives in particular contribute an important part." As might be expected, the picturesque aspects of ancient and mediæval life are those to be chiefly chosen, while from the close of the Crusades colonization and self-government hold the field. Mr. Kemp's book is not only an ingenious experiment, but, placed in the hands of a good teacher, may well be of benefit to those who are so unfortunate as to be driven to the public school for a kind of instruction in history and folklore that the favored gain at their mother's knee.

A pamphlet of sixty-six pages, with a disproportionately long title, gives the result of Dr. J. Geddes's researches into the language and literature of French Canada during the last few years. In spite of ample and accurate bibliographical tabulation, this essay is scanty in comment except in the matter of phonology applied to the determination of pronunciation as heard in various parts of French-speaking Canada; and when we note the phonetic equivalents offered for sounds familiar to those who live in that country, we doubt that the scientific investigator's ear has all the finer delicacy apparently taken for granted. The subject is one concerning which French-Canadians often show a keen, almost morbid, sensitiveness; but a three weeks' wandering about Normandy and Picardy will

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speedily convince the competent observer that French as spoken in Canada (sometimes even by educated men) is for the most part *un parler de paysan*. We are further disposed to think that the majority of students have little idea how rapidly the French of towns becomes Anglicized; the examples suggested in the essay are not nearly exhaustive. The two following, heard recently by the present reviewer, are typical—*sortir*, in the sense of 'to go out into society,' and "Ton *brake* est *jammé*." A stenographer in a public office explained his spelling of a word in the striking barbarism of "J'use une capitale."

Chateaubriand's prose masterpiece suffers no detriment in Mr. Teixeira de Mattos's splendid translation of the concluding volumes of the 'Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe' (Putnams). To render the brilliant color, glow, and rhythmical swing of the original in an English version free from any but the most trifling blemishes, implies not only exceptional bilingualism, but a sense of finer quality in style fully comparable to that of Professor de Sumichrast in his kindred work with Théophile Gautier. The explanatory biographical notes are careful and accurate, if possibly too thickly strewn for the average educated reader, who would willingly dispense with date and fact concerning Tertullian, Brutus, and Silvio Pellico, though he might welcome the suggestion that "Sir Ashwood," mentioned by Président des Brosses as taking part in irreverent ceremonies at Rome in 1740, was no other than the notorious Sir Francis Dashwood, the crony of John Wilkes and the rest of the blaspheming crew of Medmenham Abbey. To Chateaubriand's concluding profession of faith, religious and political, to his championship of ideals followed steadfastly through fortunes good or bad, and to the fervor of his impassioned speech, his present translator has done ample justice.

In two additional volumes of 'Pages Choisies' (Paris: Colin), M. Paul Bonnefou undertakes Beaumarchais, while M. Samuel Rochblave seeks to give an adequate impression of Mme. de Staël in about 300 pages of extract and commentary. With the selections there is little ground for criticism, except that for Beaumarchais's letter on the failure of his "Barbier" we should have preferred the dissertation on sentimental drama, so much more coherent than Diderot's essay on the same subject. The biographical introductions to both volumes are reasonably compact and free from marked partisanship.

To readers familiar with Mr. Bolton King's 'Italy To-day,' the recent sketch of Italian conditions entitled 'Notes sur l'Italie Contemporaine,' by Paul Ghio (Paris: Colin), offers little that is really new, for the two books cover virtually the same ground, profess closely kindred views on a number of questions, and differ chiefly in bulk and fulness. We note that, among the authorities cited by M. Ghio, his predecessor's work fails to occur; and yet Mr. King's book is far from being a negligible quantity. But the more recent writer's socialist sympathies are possibly his most striking characteristic; they lead him to the length of saying that the general strike at Florence in 1902 "a démontré, une fois de plus, la cohésion *morale* qui existe parmi les ouvriers des villes." It is unfortunate that ambiguity should lie in an adjective. In a professedly sketchy work, imperfectly verified statements are bound to occur; yet who will vouch for the assertion (p. 53) that the land in France is "certainement moins fertile" than in Italy? Palmerston held differently.

The sumptuous serial folio edition of 'Amsterdam in the Seventeenth Century,' now in process of publication (The Hague: Van Stockum), has reached its twentieth "aflevering" or division. Besides being a superb typographic triumph, the portraits being especially well reproduced, it gives a very lively picture, in the century of its richest bloom, of the city that rose like Venice out of the waves and mire. In many ways this work is a thesaurus of data for Manhattan origins, and explains much of the thought and real life of the first settlers of New York. The part just issued treats of the religious, literary and artistic side of cosmopolitan and tolerant Amsterdam, in which Jew and Gentile, Papist and Protestant, free-thinker and Anabaptist, found homes and prosperity. Above all other cities, Amsterdam had the Erasmian temper, restrained the violent ecclesiastics of the State church, and welcomed all industrious persons who behaved themselves with ordinary decency. Spinoza, Arminius, Bekker (who put witchcraft to flight), are here represented, together with realistic Jewish and other "interiors," some bearing witness to the commendable system of charities for which Holland was and is noted.

'Osaka and the Exhibition of 1903' is the title of a neat handbook, published by Ichizo Miwa, which sets forth information concerning the fifth national exposition of arts and industry in "the Venice of Japan." After Tokio in 1877, 1881, and 1890, Kioto in 1895 (in celebration of the eleven-hundredth year of its foundation) held such an exhibition. Now, Osaka, always the great commercial centre of the empire, with easy railway communication with all ports and cities, a population of 922,000, and an area of 8.6 square miles, will keep open house from March 1 to July 31, 1903. The site chosen is in the extreme southern section of the city, and close to the theatres and places of amusement. It covers about eighty-one acres. The ten large edifices will be devoted to agriculture, forestry, marine products, industry, machinery, education, fine arts, transportation, live stock, and the aquarium. A special building will be erected for the display of foreign samples. Prince Kanin no Miya is the honorary president. Along with congresses of science, there will be a grand celebration by two thousand Buddhist priests, in full canonicals, of the thirteen-hundredth anniversary of the death of Prince Shotoku, the virtual founder of Japanese Buddhism, and the casting in his honor of a bell, to weigh 89 tons and be 26 feet high and 16 feet in diameter. Much other information concerning places near this historic focus in Japan is given. The little book shows that the Japanese have mastered the art of advertising, and understand "Who's Who."

A tasteful little pamphlet from the Heintzeman Press, Boston, embodies the annual report of the Germanic Museum Association for 1901-2, with views of the Museum itself (the quondam Harvard gymnasium), externally and internally, and of the statue of the Great Elector in Berlin, a full-size cast of which is a portion of Emperor William's gift to this budding institution. A list of the objects already in place and on public view consists of fifteen items or classes, including monuments from Hildesheim, Bamberg, Strassburg, Regensburg, Schleswig, etc. Important additions, the gift of Prince Henry, will arrive in the spring. Meanwhile the directors offer a list of desirable objects in facsimile with prices at which they are procurable annexed, ranging from reproductions of ivory diptychs at four for a dollar, to a cathedral chandelier in gilded copper at $5,000. The enterprise now seems most happily launched, and appeals to the German and the *Kultur* sentiment of the entire country. Professor Francke is the Curator, at Cambridge, Mass.

Earthquake observations and their revelation of the physical nature of the earth's interior and its surface changes are treated luminously by Prof. John Milne in the *Geographical Journal* for January. He estimates that "on the average every year 30,000 earthquakes take place, each of which disturbs from ten up to several hundreds of square miles." One practical value of these observations, made at 38 stations in different parts of the world, is that engineers and builders in earthquake-shaken countries now build to withstand known forces. In Japan, where about 1,000 shocks are recorded every year, the Government maintains at its University "a professor and assistant professor of this subject, whose duties in part consist in giving to students of engineering and architecture a course of instruction bearing upon their future profession." An interesting seismic map of the world accompanies the paper. In some notes on the new boundary between Chile and the Argentine Republic recommended by the Arbitration Tribunal it is stated that, though Chile has gained something in area, this being mainly unprofitable mountain slopes, "the actual extent of the award on either side has no significance." It is believed that the peaceable settlement of the dispute will cause a great increase in the raising of cattle and the production of wool, the farmers having been afraid, from want of a secure title, to invest capital in their holdings.

The principal article in *Petermann's Mitteilungen*, number twelve, is a summary of facts collected from voyagers' narratives from Dampier down in regard to two small islands, still little known, in the Bismarck Archipelago. The other contents are accounts of the physical structure of southeastern Anatolia, of the results of Sverdrup's polar explorations, of the archæological discoveries of Sven Hedin, and of the recent volcanic eruptions in Martinique, with the conclusion of Stavenhagen's history of Russian cartography.

The Baltimore Association for the Promotion of the University Education of Women is prepared to offer a fellowship of the value of $500 for the year 1903-04, available at home or abroad, with a preference for women from Maryland and the South. Applications should be presented before March 30. Blank forms may be had of the President, Miss McLane, No. 1101 North Charles Street.

—A new series of histories for secondary schools (American Book Company) is beginning to appear under the supervision of Prof. A. B. Hart. There are to be four

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

volumes, and the word "essentials" which occurs in the title of each gives us at once a hint of the editor's idea. We have before us 'Essentials in Ancient History,' by Dr. A. M. Wolfson, and other contributors are to furnish 'Essentials in Mediæval and Modern History,' 'Essentials in English History,' and 'Essentials in American History.' In Professor Hart's words: "The titles of the volumes sufficiently suggest the point of view; the effort will be to bring out the things which have really been significant and vital in the development of the race. Personalities and events, however striking in themselves, which have not had a clear and definite effect in the movement of the world, are omitted in order that, in the brief space available, the essentials may be more clearly presented." Short bibliographies are provided, and sets of topics for review and study also appear at the end of each chapter. We should add that, in the choice of questions, Professor Hart seeks to provide for the needs of those who will read but little outside the text, and of those who are willing to read more at large. Altogether, the scheme shows signs of having been prepared in the light of the most modern pedagogical opinion. The opening volume, which is supplied by Dr. Wolfson, begins with the Egyptians and descends to Charlemagne. It has the virtues of clearness and simplicity, besides being a vehicle of sufficient information. The most striking feature of Dr. Wolfson's treatment is his copious quotation from ancient authors. Snatches from Thucydides and Plutarch, from Livy and Appian, occur at frequent intervals, and introduce an element of pleasing variety. We are particularly glad to welcome any device which aims at the restoration of Plutarch to the place he once filled, but has lost in the last hundred years. The book is illustrated by well-chosen cuts and well-printed maps. The bibliographies, though not extensive, may be called adequate to the purpose. Professor Hart himself will contribute the volume on 'Essentials in American History.'

—The second volume of Mr. J. P. Gordy's 'Political History of the United States' (Holt) merits, in general, the same approbation bestowed on its predecessor. The period covered is the twenty years from 1809 to 1829. The treatment of the important events which fall within these years is not, indeed, very even either in space or in fulness of detail. The account of the embargo and non-intercourse episodes, for example, is especially full and enlightening, while the Missouri Compromise and the beginnings of the slavery controversy are much more lightly touched. Half of the volume is devoted to the six years ending with 1815. We are not wholly clear, either, as to just what Mr. Gordy means by "political" history. Apparently, if we may judge from the volume before us, he means principally the history of what was said and done in Congress. Considerable portions of his book, for example, are filled with little else than summaries of speeches and accounts of proceedings in the Senate and House of Representatives. Doubtless, for the period here dealt with, Congress was the most important centre of political activity, but there were other forces shaping political action into which Mr. Gordy does not much go. Thus, he tells us little about Presidential campaigns, little about State politics, little about the economic and social changes which, in the period after 1815, so radically altered the current of political thought and the course of party politics. Still, an author is entitled to choose his field, so only that he works it thoroughly; and within its limits Mr. Gordy's book is an excellent performance, and one heartily to be recommended. We make but one other general criticism: we think that Mr. Gordy is too severe on the Federalists, and does not sufficiently bring out the reasons for their attitude as a party of opposition. We note that the running-title of the volume is "Political Parties in the United States"—a title which, as applied to the first edition, is said in the preface to have been found to be "inapt."

—'The Power of Taxation, State and Federal, in the United States,' is the subject of a treatise by Frederick N. Judson, published by the F. H. Thomas Law Book Company (St. Louis). The author's aim is to show the limitations of the taxing power of the State and of the Federal Government, as declared and expounded by the Supreme Court of the United States. Decisions of the State courts and inferior Federal courts are cited as applying and illustrating the limitations thus declared. The only book with which it can be readily compared is the now classical work of Judge Cooley; and, as the last edition of that treatise appeared in 1886, Mr. Judson's volume may be considered as being, in some directions, a continuation and supplement of it. For instance, we may find in Cooley the earlier view of a "direct" tax under the Federal Constitution; but to enjoy the illumination shed on the subject by the Supreme Court in the recent income-tax cases, we must go to the pages of Judson. The later author wisely imitates the courts in refusing to discuss the questions which have come up for adjudication in any other light than that of the law. As was observed in the great case of Knowlton vs. Moore, a tax may be a direct tax economically, yet an indirect tax Constitutionally. "No microscopic examination as to the purely economic or theoretical nature of the tax should be indulged in for the purpose of placing it in a category which would invalidate the tax." Indeed, we may venture to go further and say that, under the principles of construction avowed by the Supreme Court, a tax may be a direct tax in fact, and yet an indirect tax in law. An inheritance tax, for instance, is not a direct tax Constitutionally, though no one who ever paid an inheritance tax ever found anything indirect in it. Mr. Judson brings out what, to some minds, have appeared the inconsistencies of these decisions, without attempting to reconcile them with either economic theory or the grovelling facts of everyday life. Mr. Judson's work seems, so far as we have been able to examine it, accurately and well done.

—The fifth volume of Doubleday, Page & Co.'s Variorum and Definitive Edition of the Works of Edward FitzGerald comprises his two dramas after Calderon, viz., "The Mighty Magician" and "Such Stuff as Dreams are Made of," and not only the preface to his 'Polonius' (as in Wright's three-volume edition of the Literary Remains of 1889), but the whole body of that "collection of wise saws and modern instances." This is as it should be, not merely because of the thread of connection which FitzGerald here and there supplies to other men's posies, or the translations and verse which he anonymously intercalates, but because the choice itself is the man. When this warm-hearted recluse twice quotes "Be not solitary, be not idle," who can question that he sought in reading and in composition to observe the precept, however shut out from the world? Twice he holds up plain living and high thinking, which was the mirror of himself; and we recognize both the admirer of Crabbe and the recorder of Suffolk folk phrases in the section on the poor and on the need of happy English laborers and a "bold peasantry" (borrowing here from one of Bewick's moralizing vignettes). Written surely by his own somewhat insular musical hand is the sentence, "One may conceive that Handel is wholesomer for a people than Bellini." "Taste is the feminine of genius," again, is Fitz upon Fitz. And that the two extracts involving references to Voltaire are both slants at him, surely indicates a personal bias. Bacon, Carlyle, Lavater, and Rochefoucauld are conspicuous contributors to this collection; there are two quotations from Tennyson and two even from "Daddy" Wordsworth. From Carlyle nothing is, for FitzGerald, more grimly autobiographic than the extract in confutation of Diderot's cynical view of the marriage covenant: "'Thou makest a vow,' says he, twice or thrice, as if the argument were a clencher—'Thou makest a vow of Eternal constancy under a rock which is even then crumbling away.'" In respect of Bacon, it is interesting to remark the footnote (here on page 203): "And might not a passage like the following make one suppose Shakspere had Bacon in his eye as the original Polonius, if the dates tallied?" This was printed in 1852, and the idea haunted FitzGerald in 1874, when he wrote: "I used to tell Spedding that Polonius was meant for Lord Bacon; but I doubt the Dates won't bear me out." The single extract from Montaigne is taken from a copy in which FitzGerald had inscribed it; but we cannot believe he wrote "une jeune homme," as in line one of page 245; and we apprehend that "q'une" on page 284 is not reprinted faithfully from the Pickering edition. In fact, both the French and the Greek of this volume are sadly in need of revision—which is a pity where all else is sumptuous.

—The strongly Germanic section Lief—Lock of volume vi. of the Oxford English Dictionary (H. Frowde) presents, under Mr. Henry Bradley's editorship, a varied interest. Take the legal term "lien," for example. In England three modes of pronunciation are in vogue, two disyllabic (lee-en and ly-en) and one monosyllabic (leen). This last is allowed to be the prevailing one in the United States. How phonetic spelling-reform would deal with such a case is not obvious. What would it do, again, in the two countries with "lieutenant"? "Leftenant" is all but exclusively heard in England, and all but universally unheard here. The origin of the English pronunciation is perplexing. "The hypothesis of a mere misinterpretation of the graphic form (*u* read as *v*), at first sight plausible, does not accord with the facts," we are told. "Lutenand," "luf-tenand," "leeftenanunt," and "lieutenant," are the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

first four forms cited (date, 1375, 1387, 1390). In the compound word "lieutenant-general," by the way, it is remarked that though the second member is historically an adjective, the plural is now formed at the end and not in the middle. The American development of "locate" and "location" is recorded without scorn; it furnishes, in fact, an excellent instance of flexible adaptation to new conditions. In the case of the verb we have the field (and it is a pretty broad field) nearly all to ourselves. The use of the verb "loan" in the sense of 'to lend' is labelled "now chiefly U. S."—emphasis on now—and the quotations show that no Englishman can throw stones at us for that most natural and regular derivation of the verb from the substantive. Mr. Bradley does not tax us with the invention of "loaf," the verb, saying that its origin is obscure, and that Lowell's conjecture that it is connected with the German dialectic *lofen* (*laufen*), 'to run,' is without foundation, that verb not having the alleged sense of 'saunter up and down.' "Loafer" occurs first in Dana's 'Two Years before the Mast,' in 1840, when he styled it "the newly invented Yankee word." "Lobby," of monastic origin as a noun, is another striking instance, in this section of the Dictionary, of American creation and extension in verbal application. England has not disdained to follow after us in this.

—The use of the conjunction "like" for "like as" or "as," which among Americans is either local or the sign of underbreeding, is under the ban in England; yet, as any one may observe and Mr. Bradley points out, is chargeable to "many recent writers of standing." Its evolution is traceable to "an anacoluthic use (somewhat common in the sixteenth century)" exemplified in Spenser's "Like to an Eagle . . . hath spide a Goshauke" (1596). Darwin is the first author quoted (1866) after 1792. The adverbial employment of "lief," principally with "would," "originated chiefly from the misinterpretation of phrases like *I had as lief, I had liever*, in which *would* appears instead of *had* as early as the thirteenth century." Did this misinterpretation proceed from colloquial "'d" (=had, would)? "Literary," in its present acceptation, first turns up in 1749; Dr. Johnson ignored it (1755-1775). To "limber up" is found in Charles Lever in 1843. In the discussion of the suffix "-like," it is remarked how extraordinarily fond the late Philip James Bailey was of words of this formation. More than sixty may be counted in his 'Festus.' The Brahmanic fortune by which words come to express opposed and contrary meanings is shown in the case of "liege," which is both the lord and the vassal. "Lights," like its equivalent "lungs," takes its name from its comparative corporeal weight. "Lift" is to move up into the air (an obsolete "lift" meant 'sky'). "Lobster" and "locust" trace back to the Latin *locusta*, which designated a crustacean before it was transferred to the insect. "Locale" (substantive) for "local" is one of several instances of a pseudo-French ending to preserve the French stress and pronunciation (compare *morale*). We break off with a notice of the superfluous possessive in Mason's and Dixon's line (under Line, p. 307), as the sole quotation shows.

—The Archæological Report for 1901-1902 of the Egypt Exploration Fund contains no account of Professor Petrie's work at Abydos, since the twenty-second volume of the Memoirs of the Fund (Abydos, Part I.), in which a full report was published, is already in the hands of subscribers. The Archæological Survey has been busied chiefly with the making of careful copies of mural paintings in the northern group of tombs at Tell el-Amarna, and specifically in the tomb of Meryra (No. 3 of Lepsius). A volume containing plans, drawings, and photographs of this tomb will be published in the autumn of 1903. The first volume of the Tebtunis papyri has been distributed among the subscribers to the Græco-Roman Branch of the Fund. The most productive new work of this branch, under Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt, has lain among the tombs of the Ptolemaic period at Hîbeh, a town on the east bank of the Nile, well known to travellers by the river steamers on account of its massive walls and palm-sheltered temple ruins from the time of the XXIId dynasty. Here a considerable amount of papyrus cartonnage was obtained from mummy-wrappings of the third century B. C., and has been sent to Oxford for study. The first instalment of these papyri will be published the present year, and promises to be of exceptional interest, containing, besides the two columns of a new comedy, the discovery of which has already been chronicled, a large number of classical fragments, including parts of two new odes of Pindar, and a piece of the lost *Cesti* of Julius Africanus. A Greek sepulchral inscription found on the site, and a number of fragments of papyri of the Roman period exhumed from rubbish heaps, indicate that the Greek name of Hîbeh may be κώμη Φιλονίκου. A large number of papyrus documents of about the middle of the first century B. C., both Greek and demotic, were also found in the wrappings of mummied crocodiles at Khamsîn, near Tebtunis. The Report also contains the usual excellent summaries of progress in Egyptology reported from other sources.

LIFE AND LETTERS OF MAX MÜLLER.

The Life and Letters of the Right Honourable Friedrich Max Müller. Edited by his Wife. In two volumes. Longmans, Green & Co. 1902.

The essentially pious character of this collection of familiar letters written and received by Müller would make unnecessary any extended review in the *Nation* were it not that 'Life and Letters' calls in question the correctness of a certain statement made in the *Nation* itself at the time of Müller's death, to the effect that the latter's edition of the Rig Veda, for which he was wont to claim sole credit, was not really his at all, but the work was done by a German scholar, Aufrecht, who was the editor of the *editio prima*, the title claimed by Müller; and that Aufrecht deserves the chief credit for Müller's own edition.

This statement is not so "extraordinary" as is made to appear in 'Life and Letters'; nor does the fact that it was published "anonymously" and "after Müller's death" affect the question, when one considers that it was not very novel, that it made part of an obituary notice, and that such notices in the *Nation* are usually unsigned. Doubtless, however, all adverse criticism seems malicious to friends, and these points, together with the final reproach that the statement emanates from America, require no special comment. The affair is now half a century old, and the reviewer believes that *nil nisi bonum* must yield to *nisi verum* in matters of history. That the Right Honorable F. Max Müller let others do his work for him was, as will appear, privately admitted even by himself. That in public he took the credit, he who runs may read in Müller's popular books. This is the sum of the charge.

The defence in 'Life and Letters' is based partly upon a one-sided statement of the facts, and partly upon a wilful misunderstanding of the indictment. Where the reviewer said that the work for which Müller was wont to claim credit was not really his at all, the defence somewhat disingenuously, or passionately, twice italicizes *all;* and, interpreting this to mean that Müller had absolutely nothing to do with the edition, triumphantly claims that such an allegation is false. But if Kipling is hired to write a poem, and, after doing one stanza, hires some one else to keep on with it, contenting himself with adding the last stanza and examining the whole before it goes to press, the critic is quite justified in saying "this is not Kipling's work at all." Nor is it a sufficient answer to say that Aufrecht's work was "fully recognized." Where is it recognized? If one looks through the prefaces to the various Sanskrit volumes, one may find that Aufrecht's assistance is after a fashion formally acknowledged; but even here it is never stated what was the true relation between the employer and his "secretary." On the contrary, in summing up, in the last volume, Müller, with the usual perfunctory civility of a scholar indebted to his friends, mentions the "advice and active coöperation" of "Aufrecht, Fitz-Edward Hall, and Haug," as if the three stood in the same class in giving assistance; while in the preface to the third volume it is said, in the same way, that much of the correctness and accuracy of the last volumes (*sic*) is due to the co-operation of Aufrecht and the assistance of Wilson. Who could imagine from this that the whole volume had been prepared for him by Aufrecht's own hand?

Yet the reviewer had in mind not so much the formal partial payment made in little-read prefaces of Sanskrit texts, as the lack of all due acknowledgment in works intended for the public. Here it must be repeated very emphatically that, as no adequate acknowledgment of Aufrecht's services was ever made by Müller even in the prefaces to the various Sanskrit volumes, where caution alone made imperative some polite statement, for the general public there was no recognition of Aufrecht's work. In his 'Chips,' for example, Müller does not even mention Aufrecht's assistance, but in the 'Autobiography' he alludes sneeringly to the fact that "another scholar, who had assisted me and had the use of my manuscripts, anticipated part of the last volume of my edition," leaving it to be inferred that some underling assistant had pilfered from him, and that the criminal's name was magnanimously suppressed. "I have received great credit for my edition of the Rig Veda," Müller says in 'Last Essays' (p. 313), "and people wondered at the time how it was done." But he never told them, though the ex-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

planation might have been given in one name.

For what are the facts? Müller was hired to bring out the Rig Veda. A part of the work had already been done by Rosen. This part of the text, together with the commentary, Müller brought out without Aufrecht's assistance. But Müller had already grown weary of this scholarly toil. He spoke of it as "slavery," and said that, in his opinion, life was meant for more than the "drudgery of collating manuscripts." So, for part of the next volume and for all of the third volume, he hired Aufrecht to do his work for him, though it was just the work he himself had been hired to do; for a task of this sort is entrusted to a scholar *quâ* scholar, and not to be handed over to his secretary. But, sick of the work he had undertaken, Müller first left the drudgery to Aufrecht, and then, after the latter had got through working for him (first as "secretary" performing the laborious toil of preparing books three, four, five, six, and part of seven, and then as collaborator helping him with books seven and eight), dropped the undertaking in despair, neglecting it for years (his own confession) for more congenial employment. There remained, however, only two books more to do, and since in the meantime Aufrecht had published independently the complete text, including these two books, Müller at last, after a pause of ten years, aided now by younger scholars who had grown up since the work was begun, brought out these books also, with the commentary.* Thus while Weber in ten years published text, Brâhmana, and Sûtra of the Yajur Veda, with sufficient commentary, and did it without parade or assistance, the Rig Veda with its commentary dragged along for thirty years, the vacant interval of ten years beginning the moment Aufrecht stopped working for Müller. The *editio prima* or *princeps* of the complete text was published independently by Aufrecht in 1861-1863. The Müller-Aufrecht edition (with commentary) was published in 1849-1874. In later years, when charged with misappropriation of the title "first edition," Müller's defence was that this referred to the commentary!

But it must not be supposed that an anonymous writer in America was the first to feel troubled at the apportionment of credit due to the editors of the Müller-Aufrecht edition. The warmest friend Müller ever had—his behavior estranged from him all the best Sanskrit scholars of the Continent—was Bunsen, who writes to him thus: "Mögen Sie nur sich nicht abschrecken lassen von dem Versuche, andere für sich arbeiten zu lassen in Handwerkssachen. Sie haben der Sache ja nun Ihr Siegel aufgedrückt." The manual labor thus delicately alluded to was the toil of copying and collating manuscripts, the very work Müller had engaged to do. Bunsen's fatherly advice, given in 1855, at the time the "secretary" was hard at work for Müller, was dutifully followed. Müller let others do his work for him and stamped it with his own seal. "He consoled himself," says a very friendly foreign biographer, "with these words of Bunsen, when he was reproached for letting others do his work." This biographer says in innocent explanation (but without italics): "Müller *had already begun to let others do his work in editing the Rig Veda*, and he must have written to Bunsen that it went against his conscience."

*How Aufrecht's share of the work represents but "one-third," as asserted in 'Life and Letters,' it is difficult to understand. Probably the index is here made to fill the scale for Müller. It takes up the latter half of the last two volumes, but it is no credit to its compiler, being both unintelligently made and incomplete, though Müller assured Bergaigne that it contained every word and form in the Rig Veda!

A GREAT SCHOOLMASTER.

Edward Bowen: A Memoir. By the Rev. the Hon. W. E. Bowen, M.A. Longmans, Green & Co.

The complacent ultra-patriots who assume that the English people are a long way behind us in their interest in education, would do well to take note of the publication of this book, even if they have not the time to read it. Edward Bowen was for forty-two years an assistant master at what we should call a "preparatory" school, and never held any more conspicuous position. Our periodicals are full, almost to the point of weariness, of discussions of educational method, yet what American publisher would think it worth while to issue a memoir recording the career of a man who spent his whole life as a mere teacher of boys?

The important dates in Edward Bowen's life may be given in a few lines. He was born in 1836, the son of an Evangelical clergyman. He went up to Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1854. After winning several undergraduate distinctions, he took his degree in 1858 as fourth classic, and in the following year was elected to a fellowship. During his Cambridge course he was a prominent speaker at the Union Society, of which he became president. In 1859 he went to Harrow as an assistant master. In 1863 he undertook charge of a house. In 1869 he was entrusted by the head, Dr. H. M. Butler, with the organization of a "modern side." At the general election of 1880 he stood unsuccessfully for Hertford against Mr. Arthur Balfour. In 1901 he died suddenly in France while on a cycling tour in company with his old friends, Mr. and Mrs. James Bryce. The memoir, which is written by Edward Bowen's nephew, the son of Lord Bowen, the eminent judge, is supplemented by reprints of a few essays, mainly on educational subjects, and of the school songs which will make their writer's reputation coeval with Harrow itself.

This volume appeals, of course, primarily to Bowen's numerous friends and pupils, who will prize it as refreshing their memory of a personality of unusual power and charm. But it will have a wider value as an authority on the English "public school" system in the second half of the nineteenth century. The pictures here given of Bowen at work—and at play—with his boys afford a clearer insight into the real character of that system than could be obtained from any formal discussion of it. Incidentally, either in the memoir or in the appendices, light is cast upon almost every educational question that is in dispute—the limitations of a master's authority over school games, the permission of "cribs," the most effective means of discipline, the curriculum, etc. Yet even the shrewd judgments pungently expressed on many such subjects are of less worth than the spectacle of the "public school" ideal incarnated in Bowen himself. It is indeed a living picture. We must remember that Bowen's personal qualities were exceptional, but with this reservation his memoir may be commended as perhaps the best guide to the understanding of what is meant by that particular type of education which Harrow represents.

Edward Bowen pooh-hoohed the idea that a schoolmaster could make himself popular by joining the boys in their games. "To play is no more popular in a man than in a boy. To play genially, modestly, good-temperedly, is popular in both; the more so, perhaps, if the player is really worth looking at for his skill, though this is of quite secondary value." Accordingly, he would recommend a master to join in school sports only on condition that the boys liked his doing so, and that he was perfectly sure of keeping his temper. In his own case no hesitation was imposed by either condition. He took his share in the football field until within a few weeks of his death, and as late as his fifty-ninth year saved the game for the Harrow masters, as against the Eton masters, by a supreme effort as a "back." Walking was another favorite pastime. In his youth he once tramped from Cambridge to Oxford in twenty-six consecutive hours, and in later life he went around the entire coast of England and Wales.

As a teacher, he had little faith in the new ideas about professional training, County Council inspection, and the like; and it may indeed be admitted that if all teachers were like Bowen, there would be no need of improvements in the educational mechanism. Of the teacher's function he once said:

"To convince boys that intellectual growth is noble, and intellectual labor happy, that they are travelling on no purposeless errand, mounting higher every step of the way, and may as truly enjoy the toil that lifts them above their former selves as they enjoy a race or a climb; to help the culture of their minds by every faculty of moral forces, of physical vigor, of memory, of fancy, of humor, of pathos, of banter, that we have ourselves, and lead them to trust in knowledge, to hope for it, to cherish it; this, succeed as it may here and fail there, quickened as it may be by health and sympathy, or deadened by fatigue and disappointment, is a work which has in it most of the elements which life needs to give it zest."

"Zest" was not too strong a word to describe his own relation to his teaching, nor is "enchantment" an exaggeration in depicting its influence on his pupils. "I don't know how it is, sir," it would often be said by a boy to one of Bowen's colleagues, "but if Mr. Bowen takes a lesson he makes you work twice as hard as other masters, but you like it twice as much and you learn far more." He especially possessed, we are told, both the inspiring and the driving powers which separately make so imperfect a teacher, and the combination of which is so rare.

Although a layman—a fact which militated against the proposal to make him head master when Dr. Butler resigned in 1885—Bowen gave religious instruction both to the members of his form and to the boys of his own house. One is surprised to find that more than twenty years ago his pupils were learning the rudiments of Old Testament analysis and separating Genesis into two documents for themselves. At the time of the Colenso panic, Bowen had shown himself, in articles in the *Saturday Review* and elsewhere, an uncompromising advocate of the critical school. A Harrow old

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

boy, now a distinguished Biblical scholar, testifies that, although Bowen's attitude to Scripture took his breath away at first, "to have begun scientific Biblical study under a teacher always fearless and always reverent has been to me an experience for which I cannot be too thankful." The account given here of Bowen's treatment of the most difficult problems of school ethics is full of suggestion and help to the teaching profession.

His candidature for Parliament is sufficient evidence of Bowen's breadth of outlook. He was a warm supporter of the chief domestic reforms proposed by the Liberal party, and a determined opponent of the Jingoism of Lord Beaconsfield. He hated war and militarism, and the formation of rifle corps in connection with schools provoked his intense aversion. He suffered great distress at the loss of some of his favorite pupils in the Boer war, which he believed to be both unnecessary and unjust. At the same time he was an ardent student of military history. He visited almost every important battlefield in Europe, and in 1870 followed within a few days the line of the French retreat to Wörth. In 1871 he spent his Easter holidays in Paris, which was then under the control of the Commune. Among the appendices of this memoir is the report of a lecture in which he maintained that the common idea of the character of that administration is quite mistaken.

Of Bowen's school songs Dr. Butler truly says that they were possibly his own precious, and assuredly his most enduring, contribution to the life of Harrow, and that they will take no second place among the best lyrics of this order. Even an outsider, with no local sentiment to help him, and without the assistance of John Farmer's music, can scarcely read such verses as "Forty Years On," "Byron Lay," "Queen Elizabeth," and "Giants" without a thrill. It is no disparagement to the skill of the biographer to say that, after all, the most vivid impression of the unique personality of his subject is made by the self-revelation of these school songs. After reading them, we can understand how an old pupil could declare that the tragedy of Bowen's death was not, as often in the case of other men more famous but more ordinary, that he left a great thing undone, but simply that he had ceased to be.

From Grieg to Brahms. By Daniel Gregory Mason. The Outlook Co. Pp. 225.

Five years ago a German named Fuchs wrote a book in which he classified 2,576 composers as neatly as if they had been insects and he an entomologist. Wagner and Brahms were grouped together as fourth-rate, while the fifth class included Chopin and Mascagni, with nineteen others, some of whose names are barely known to the public. Herr Fuchs took himself perfectly seriously; he even threatened to perpetrate a second volume, justifying his wondrous classification; but, so far, this further contribution to comic literature has not appeared on the horizon. One is reminded of Herr Fuchs on perusing Mr. Mason's 'From Grieg to Brahms.' Why this title, since Brahms was born in 1833 and died in 1897, while Grieg was born in 1843 and is still living? The mystery is soon solved. Mr. Mason is not a chronologist, but a classifier *à la* Fuchs, though, to be sure, on a much smaller scale. He selects for biographic and critical treatment the half-dozen composers who, in his opinion, "have done most for music in our day." These are Grieg, Dvorák, Saint-Saëns, César Franck, Tchaikovsky, and Brahms, arranged in an ascending order of importance and merit.

To judge by the bumptious, sophomoric character of the two essays on the "Appreciation" and the "Meaning" of music between which the six critical biographies are sandwiched, the author (who dedicates his book to his uncle, Dr. William Mason) must be quite a young man. His placing Brahms first and Grieg last shows, however, that he is a born musical critic; at any rate, he has the qualities which have always been the distinguishing traits of musical critics—the inability to recognize genius, the mistaking of bigness for greatness, and the ludicrous notion that because modern form is different from the form of Beethoven, it is therefore inferior—in fact, practically no form at all. This has been the shibboleth of German musical criticism, in particular, for long and wearisome decades; in adopting it, Mr. Mason shows himself sadly behind the times—his book is already antiquated. The new spirit of German criticism, which recognizes the right of every genius to create forms of its own, and which does not fancy a painted barrel to be a greater work of art than a Japanese vase simply because it is bigger and "more universal," is exemplified in the two latest histories of nineteenth-century music, Riemann's and Grunsky's, which may be commended to our author's attention.

In a magazine article, Grieg once compared the typical critic to a wet poodle who comes into the parlor and selects the best piece of furniture to lie on. Mr. Mason does this in regard to Grieg's music. He praises the early pieces, written while Grieg was still largely under German influence; but finds little merit or charm in the later compositions, in which the Norwegian has really given us his very best. It is thus that the critics used to praise the early at the expense of the later Wagner, and the drawing-room Chopin at the expense of what Mr. Huneker has happily called the Greater Chopin. It is very wearisome. The fact noted by the author that amateurs adore Grieg and that professionals shrug their shoulders at him, while the reverse is true in regard to Brahms, would have opened Mr. Mason's eyes as to the topsy-turviness of his ranklist had he been familiar with the history of musical genius. Whenever there has been such a disagreement, the amateurs have invariably worsted the professionals.

It is to be greatly regretted that Mr. Mason lacks the insight to appreciate Grieg's peculiar genius, for his book is the only one in our language that has the Norwegian's name in its title; admirers of Grieg who are attracted by that will find it but a misleading guide. Oddly enough, even in the case of Brahms, Mr. Mason does not single out the best of his works for praise. His articles on Dvorák, Saint-Saëns, Franck, and Tchaikovsky are more commendable, although they contain nothing new; but his placing of César Franck ahead not only of Grieg, but of Dvorák and of Saint-Saëns, again reminds of us of our friend Herr Fuchs.

Ohio and her Western Reserve. With a Story of three States, leading to the latter, from Connecticut, by way of Wyoming, its Indian wars and massacre. By Alfred Mathews, Member of the Ohio State Archæological Society, etc. Illustrations and Maps. D. Appleton & Co. 1902.

The leading contention of Mr. Mathews may be stated as follows: Puritanism, which in England had congealed into a frozen creed, in New England continued as ardent as ever, and was engrafted with progressivism. The selected wheat was best winnowed when resown in Connecticut, which, by best working out human liberty and political righteousness, became the most democratic and religious of all colonies, and through all migrations and transmigrations has retained its identity. Her grasp and grip on that part of Pennsylvania which lay within her latitude—authorized by a literal interpretation of her charter—led to an interstate war for fifty years, 1757-1807, as conscientious on both sides as our national civil war, half as comic as an *opéra bouffe*, half so tragic that one of its scenes was an Indian massacre of more victims than at any other in American annals. The squatters, seven times evicted, were adjudged trespassers by the highest authorities, yet their heirs recovered exemplary damages, and their mother State, greedy as Cerberus, secured a sop bigger than herself—the Western Reserve. There, spacious in the possession of dirt, she had free course and has been glorified. Thanks to the Ordinance of 1787, the new departure not only was saved from slavery, but had more than magnetic attractions for those come-outers from every slave State who felt that slavery, if not a crime, was at least a blunder. Accordingly, Ohio was swiftly settled; its limits were made broad owing to political necessities, and it was early an abolition hotbed. Champions of freedom there had ideal routes for underground railroads; and though—or because—sometimes martyred, they had their reward, while their political successors have been most successful in obtaining and retaining offices, downward from the Presidency to the lowest depth.

The points now outlined—Connecticut, born of Massachusetts, having a new birth in its original dominion, militant on the rivers of Pennsylvania and triumphant in the West, not only in the Reserve, but in all Ohio—are the theme of Mr. Mathews, which is treated with energy, eloquence, and plausibility, with provincial prejudice and personal enthusiasm, and will interest many who in not a few particulars cannot agree with the author's views. His story of three States grew out of one address and two magazine papers—indeed, it is largely a rehash of the three—a combination for which the clumsy title-page shows it was hard to devise a name. The speech before the Wyoming Commemorative Association at Wyoming was ideal for its time and place; but all the three sources of the work before us are rhetorical rather than historical in style and make-up—they are the special pleading of an advocate rather than the fruits of judicial impartiality. References to authorities, dates, and exact statements, more and more demanded from the time of Gibbon, are conspicuously absent.

The volume is one of a series called the "Expansion of the Republic," and Con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

necticut's claims overlap those of all its neighbors, West as well as East. They must provoke much damaging criticism, and sometimes be confronted with refutations as complete as the Quaker State, when fairly stirred up, made of the Nutmeg's usurpations of her soil. Massachusetts will maintain that Ohio's debt to Cutler is greater than to any man of Connecticut, and will resent the statements that her children who founded Connecticut were superior to their parents in the township idea, or in churches and schools, either doctrinally or practically; and will compare Connecticut boasting of her improvements to an infant perched on its father's shoulder, and exclaiming, "I am taller than papa!" Vermont will be indignant at the portrait of Ethan Allen, with the statement that Connecticut "sent him into the field." It was not in the name of Connecticut that the surrender of "Ty" was demanded. The Quaker State will hold Franklin as worth more to her than any score of Connecticut interlopers; six-sevenths of Ohio will say that too much is arrogated to their other seventh, the "Connecticut corner." On comparative study, then, something of the glories which have been heaped upon the threefold Connecticut will fare like the jackdaw's plumage in Æsop, until there is a more careful restatement and readjustment of interstate relations, obligations, and contributions.

Euclid: His Life and System. By Thomas Smith, D.D., LL.D. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1902. 12mo, pp. 217.

Dr. Smith's style is light and easy, *plena litteratæ senectutis oratio;* for the author is one who can speak of the quantification of the predicate as a novelty (it was only introduced in 1827), and who, in the words, "In our time, Gauss has shown," etc., refers to a publication of 1801. He has not forgotten his Greek, for he reads Proclus, and he constantly reminds us most winningly of what the education of a gentleman used to be. *Quid enim est jucundius senectute, stipata studiis juventutis?*

The little volume is not intended for scholars, but for those who know no more of Euclid and his science than they learned in the high school; and where the reader's attention may threaten to tire, he is refreshed by something of a facetious turn until he is ready to resume the more serious discourse. One will naturally not expect the author to have the least inkling of the way of thinking of modern mathematicians about the 'Elements.' He treats the "theory of parallels" in the good old way, taking his stand with those who were valiantly resolved to demonstrate that the theorem that the three angles of a plane triangle are equal in sum to two right angles, follows as a necessary consequence from certain premises concerning a plane, although it stared them in the face that these premises are equally true of the surface of a sphere, while the sum of the angles of a spherical triangle exceeds two right angles. Stated in this way, their undertaking was manifestly predestined to eternal failure. One-half of this state of things was clear to the mind of Euclid. That is to say, his confusion of thought about one-half of it arose from two subconscious assumptions, the recognition of which would have made him wholly right. One of these was that space is immeasurably great. That he assumed this appears (among other places) in his supposed proof (I. 16) that the angles of a triangle are not *greater* than two right angles; and that he assumed it irreflectively is shown by the language of his second postulate compared with the use he put it to. It reads that a terminated straight line can be produced continuously (*κατὰ τὸ συνεχές*); but he applies it as if it read "can be prolonged beyond any assigned length." His other unconscious assumption is that all the figures with which he deals are finite. This is shown by his axiom (called the eighth) that the whole is greater than its part. For, of course, Euclid knew well enough that a straight line terminated at one end only, and endless in the further direction, is not made any shorter by cutting off a finite part of it, since what remains can be shoved along to cover the extension occupied by the whole, and, being endless, leaves no part uncovered. These two assumptions not being explicitly made, his proof of the sixteenth proposition which we have just (substantially) quoted, remains imperfect. To prove that the sum of the angles of a plane triangle is not *less* than two right angles, he plainly saw that a special assumption was necessary, and stated this in his fifth postulate (which Professor Smith calls the twelfth axiom) in such a form that it should manifestly appear the matter of fact it really is, and not a matter of pure reason, or an axiom. The whole tribe of old laudators of Euclid (of whom our author is one), though they all but deify him, fail to give him credit for understanding this matter, which they do not understand themselves; but, on the contrary, regard the postulate which proclaims his understanding of it as the greatest blemish upon his work.

This booklet is not intended for people who care to gain a profound understanding of Euclid, or to acquire any minutely accurate information, and therefore small slips are innocuous. But we should deceive our readers if we did not warn them that such slips there are, and thick as leaves in Vallombrosa. For example, we are told in sundry places that Euclid the mathematician was not Euclides "of Megæra." That is true, since that dreadful personage had no Euclid. But neither was our Euclid that eristic philosopher who lived in the town that had come to be called the "Edifices"—Τὰ Μέγαρα, the quantity of which Dr. Smith, with his Greek, will perceive if he thinks of the chatter of Penelope's suitors.

"*μνηστῆρες δ' ὁμάδησαν ἀνὰ μέγαρα σκιόεντα.*"

With singular obliviousness, he says that Alexander survived his master, Aristotle, for a year, although in different places in the book the dates of both deaths are rightly given. It is the same with the mathematical work. On p. 208 he begins an attempted demonstration of a proposition which has been fully proved to be indemonstrable. Here is a bit from which to judge it: "The triangles ABC, BAD have . . . an angle DAC . . . = angle ACB." Now, even without a figure, it is pretty clear that DAC is not an angle either of the triangle ABC or of the triangle BAD. It is no misprint, but a slip that brings the whole demonstration to ruin. Dr. Smith has four triangles, formed by the two diagonals and four sides of the quadrilateral ABCD, and it was requisite to show that the pair of triangles he mentions were equal. He has become confused among the four, has inadvertently substituted a different triangle for one of them, and the whole demonstration is, consequently, a blunder. A "proof," substantially of the same thing (though the author appears not to see that it proves this or nothing), on page 213, is even more plainly inconclusive.

England is the only civilized country where it often happens that an educated man will write a book in which he makes it plain, sometimes even blandly confesses, that he has not taken the trouble to acquaint himself with the most accessible and pertinent facts. We must not blame an individual for following the established customs of his own country, but we are bound to instance at least one case among many in which Professor Smith shows himself the thorough Briton that he is in this respect. There is a considerable account and criticism of Legendre's treatment of parallels, which was certainly called for by the general plan of Professor Smith's book. But this account and criticism is based exclusively on Brewster's translation of Legendre's 'Éléments de Géométrie.' Now Legendre became dissatisfied with his original treatment of the matter, and in his third edition completely revolutionized it. Subsequently, he decided that his new demonstration was invalid, and in his ninth edition returned to the method of Euclid. Still later, he imagined that he had found a way out of the labyrinth, and in the fourteenth (and no doubt in some intermediate editions to which we are unable at this moment to refer) he made a new attempt, very curious and subtle, as it had to be to deceive Legendre, but quite worthless as a proof—namely, he distorts his triangle, so as to make one of the angles smaller and smaller, while the sides are so lengthened that the area of the triangle remains unchanged; and he thinks he proves that this process can go on until, that angle vanishing, all three sides lie in a straight line, *although the area of the triangle remains finite,* and without investigating to what limit the values of the other angles tend. Legendre, in an appendix, gives a still different attempt at a demonstration, which really begs the question, and in one edition is substantially admitted to do so. Of all these changes, Dr. Smith knows nothing, and his criticisms of what he does know of Legendre's work (concerning which two opinions are no longer possible for competent men) admit points that ought to be denied, and deny what ought to be admitted.

A particularly amusing case of writing in complacent consciousness of lacking proper information is a certain speculation about entirely known facts regarding the commentary on Euclid by Campanus—a speculation provoked by a similarly ignorant passage from a certain 'Short History of Mathematics,' which pushes the national custom to a conspicuous eminence. But we cannot give more space to this.

There is much in the volume about the educational value of elementary geometry. In the broad sense that mathematics is good mental discipline, and that modern mathematicians are the only men who reason with precision, we think the author quite right. That is as far as we can go along with him. To judge of the matter

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it would be indispensable to inquire how far elementary metric geometry reasons correctly, and whether or not, in rendering its reasoning sound (without which it must be positively mischievous), it would not necessarily become far too difficult for the average boy. There is a way in which, by easy exercises, geometry would gradually develop great logical strength in almost any boy; but it supposes such a revolution in the methods of presentation and of instruction as would be practicable only in a country where teachers were more genuinely educated and had more leisure and stimulus to study than they have in ours. In default of that, the very inferior, but much easier, subject of the theory of numbers affords a far sounder discipline of the logical powers.

Handbook of Birds of the Western United States. By Florence Merriam Bailey. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1902.

Bird students have long wanted a comprehensive manual of Western birds that should correspond to Mr. Frank M. Chapman's authoritative and attractive manual of Eastern birds. The book just published by Mrs. Bailey meets the need in a highly satisfactory way. The author records original observations on nearly every page, and she has thoroughly explored the literature of Western birds even down to publications of which the ink is hardly dry. Though the book is in the main a systematic work, it begins with short essays on the migration, the distribution, the economic value, and the protection of birds, and methods of studying them and of preparing specimens. Several local lists and a bibliography complete the introductory matter. The main body of the work takes up systematically every species and subspecies of bird in the United States west of the hundredth meridian. An important feature is the system of keys similar to that employed by Chapman and Ridgway. Illustrations are given for nearly all the birds, many of them from drawings by the best of our bird artists, Mr. Louis Agassiz Fuertes. Some of the other illustrations, particularly those made from photographs of skins, do not quite reach the nicety of execution otherwise uniform in the book.

The keys and the numerous illustrations make the work of identifying birds comparatively easy. Suppose that the student has in his hand a certain bird closely associated "with the fields of dry cornstalks and the smoky, budding wood-lots" of early spring, and with the frosty stubble and sere thickets of autumn. The key shows him, by the character of the bill and the size and position of the hind toe, that the bird belongs to the order of gallinaceous birds. Turning to the special key to that order, he finds that because his bird is without spurs, metallic plumage, and naked head or vaulted tail, it is excluded from the family of turkeys and pheasants, and falls into that of grouse, partridges, and quails, the Tetraonidæ. There are a dozen genera in this family, but a key supplemented by marginal drawings of the diagnostic parts of birds of the different genera is a sufficient guide. Of the two main divisions of the family, this bird belongs, not to the group in which the legs are feathered down to the base of the toes, but to that in which the contrary is true; further, it belongs to the subdivision that has no ruff, thus being separated from the ruffed grouse; still further, it fits into the minor division having the tail more than half as long as the wing, and the claws moderate. Since its head is not crested, however, it is excluded from the group of partridges. There remains for it, then, only the genus Colinus, and because it has a white throat and under parts lightly and irregularly barred, it must be *Colinus virginianus*, the common bob-white. For identifying birds in the field, without specimens, a "field key" is appended to the book.

Under each species the author notes color, measurements, and general structure, distribution, food, and character of nest and eggs, and generally adds an original description of the bird's appearance, habits, and landscape setting. In this last work, which is the most attractive part of the text, Mr. Vernon Bailey has given considerable assistance. The following extracts show the interesting style of the descriptions:

"The magpie is a feature of the landscape, whether seen in flight as a black air-ship, with white side-wheelers and long, black rudder moving against a background of red cliffs in the Garden of the Gods, or seen standing as a lay-figure on a stone wall in a Mormon village. There is always a freedom and largeness about his proceedings. Sometimes he will take wing so near that you see the green gloss on his back, flying with even water-level flight far and away, till he becomes a black dot and disappears beyond your field of vision. His masterful, positive character is not lost even when he goes squacking about his daily business. Whatever he does or says, he claims the attention of the neighborhood, except when he has a secret to hide. . . .

"The road-runner is one of the most original and entertaining of Western birds. The newcomer is amazed when the long-tailed creature darts out of the brush and races the horses down the road, easily keeping ahead as they trot, and, when tired, turns out into the brush and throws his tail over his back to stop himself. Even the oldest inhabitant likes to talk about the swift runner, whom it takes a "right peart cur to catch,' and who eats horned toads, comes to drink and feed with the hens in the dooryard one day, and the next may be hunted vainly in the dense chaparral or cactus where it makes its home." . . .

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Barnes, Anna M. The Red Mirlok. (Containing also Shan Folk-Lore Stories, by W. C. Griggs.) Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society.
Beylié, L. de. L'Habitation Byzantine: Les Anciennes Maisons de Constantinople, Supplément. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
Brooks, J. G. The Social Unrest. Macmillan.
Buchheim, C. A. Schiller's Wilhelm Tell. Rev. ed. by Hermann Schoepfeld. (Clarendon Press Popular Classics.) Henry Frowde.
Budge, E. A. W. A History of Egypt, from the End of the Neolithic Period to the Death of Cleopatra VII., B. C. 30. 8 vols. (Books on Egypt and Chaldæa.) Henry Frowde.
Burton, William. A History and Description of English Porcelain. London: Cassell & Co.; New York: A. Wessels Co. $10.
Carlyle, Thomas. The French Revolution: A History. Introduction, etc., by J. H. Rose. 3 vols. London: George Bell & Sons; New York: Macmillan. $9.
Daley, J. G. The Rose and the Sheepskin. W. H. Young & Co. $1.
Eberhardt, Max. Gedichte. Chicago: Koelling & Klappenbach. $2.50.
Fernald, J. C. Scientific Side-Lights. Funk & Wagnalls.
Flint, Robert. Agnosticism. Scribners. $2.
Grimm, Herman. Unüberwindliche Mächte. 2 vols. Berlin: J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung; New York: Lemcke & Buechner.
Hooker, Richard. Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. The Fifth Book. Macmillan.
Hulbert, A. B. Indian Thoroughfares. (Historic Highways of America.) Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Co.
Jordan, D. S. The Philosophy of Despair. San Francisco: Paul Elder and Morgan Shepard.
Leadbeater, C. W. Man Visible and Invisible. John Lane.
Lee, Sidney. Queen Victoria. A Biography. Macmillan. $3.
Lockwood, G. B. The New Harmony Communities. Marion (Ind.): G. B. Lockwood.
Mead, Elwood. Irrigation Institutions. (The Citizen's Library.) Macmillan. $1.25.
Memoirs of Francois René, Vicomte de Chateaubriand. Vols. V. and VI. (Translated by Alexander Teixeira de Mattos.) G. P. Putnam's Sons.
Mortimer, A. G. The Creeds: An Historical and Doctrinal Exposition of the Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds. Longmans, Green & Co. $1.80.
Nietzsche, Friedrich. The Dawn of Day. (Translated by Johanna Volz.) Macmillan. $2.50.
Norris, Frank. The Pit. Doubleday, Page & Co. $1.50.
Oliphant, T. L. K. Rome and Reform. 2 vols. Macmillan. $7.
Perry, W. C. The Boy's Iliad. Macmillan. $1.25.
Phillimore, J. S. Sophocles. Longmans, Green & Co. $2.
Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne. Vol. VI. Oxford (Eng.): Oxford Historical Society.
Shea, J. G. Early Voyages Up and Down the Mississippi. New ed. Albany: Joseph McDonough.
Smith, J. T. The Art of Disappearing. W. H. Young & Co. $1.50.
Spalding, J. L. Socialism and Labor, and Other Arguments. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. 80c.
Stinson, S. S. Whimlets. Philadelphia: Henry T. Coates & Co.
Von Zittel, K. A. Text-Book of Palæontology, Vol. II. (Translated by C. R. Eastman.) Macmillan. $2.75.
Wolfson, A. M., and Hart, A. B. Essentials in Ancient History. American Book Co. $1.50.
Works of Jane Austen. 5 vols. (The Hampshire Edition.) G. P. Putnam's Sons.
Writings of James Monroe, Vol. VI. G. P. Putnam's Sons. $5.

Hertwig's Manual of Zoölogy.

Translated from the fifth German edition by Prof. J. S. Kingsley of Tufts College. 704 pp. 8vo, $3.00 *net*.

Prof. E. B. Wilson, *Columbia University:* "The usefulness of Hertwig's book has long been recognized, and Prof. Kingsley has introduced many improvements that will commend themselves to American zoölogists. It is not improbable that I shall conclude to adopt this work as a text-book."

Prof. C. O. Whitman, *University of Chicago:* "I am delighted to see this manual translated by a competent naturalist, and thus placed within the reach of university and college students. It is a most welcome and important addition to the text-books now available, and the translator has done his work well, so far as I am able to judge."

Part First of this work has been translated by Prof. G. M. Field, under the title *General Principles of Zoölogy* ($1.60).

Henry Holt & Co., NEW YORK CHICAGO

JUST PUBLISHED:

The Age of the Fathers:

Being Chapters in the History of the Church during the Fourth and Fifth Centuries.

By the late William Bright, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford and Canon of Christ Church Edited by Walter Lock, D.D., Warden of Keble College, Oxford, and C. H. Turner, M.A., Magdalen College, Oxford. 2 vols., 8vo, Pages, Vol. I., viii+502; Vol. II., iv+598. $10.00 *net*.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., N. Y.

Chickering Pianos

The OLDEST *in* AMERICA;
THE BEST *in the* WORLD.

WRITE FOR CATALOGUE

Chickering & Sons

PIANO FORTE MAKERS
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

Edwin Lawrence Godkin.— Japan proof of Portrait, engraved on wood in the highest style of the art, sent, charges paid, on receipt of five dollars ($5) by Gustav Kruell, 331 Main Street, East Orange, N. J.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED